DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 423 756 HE 031 551

AUTHOR	Weaver, Henry D.
TITLE	Partial Salary Support for U.S. Faculty Working in Universities in Developing Countries: A Report to Association Liaison Office and to the U.S. Agency for International Development.
INSTITUTION	Council on International Educational Exchange, New York, NY.
SPONS AGENCY	Agency for International Development (IDCA), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1993-00-00
NOTE	138p.
PUB TYPE	Opinion Papers (120) -- Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; *Developing Nations; Feasibility Studies; Federal Aid; Focus Groups; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; International Educational Exchange; International Organizations; Teacher Employment; *Teacher Exchange Programs; *Teacher Salaries; Teacher Supply and Demand

ABSTRACT

This study examined the feasibility of a program to provide funds to U.S. faculty to fill the gap between the salary paid by a host university in a developing country and that of the home institution, with the goal of strengthening higher education institutions in developing countries. The project involved study of similar programs, faculty focus groups, and consultations with associations of foreign universities. Individual sections of the report address findings from focus groups, evidence of the need for short-term faculty personnel, data on the potential supply of U.S. faculty, likely benefits of such a program, and the operational experience of organizations placing faculty in foreign institutions. A proposed operational plan for a salary-support program stresses the following elements: flexibility, sustained collaboration, priorities of the host country, communication facilities, the university acceptance process, logistics, direction in the field, the management plan, and financial needs of awardees. The proposal offers a plan with three components grants to individuals, grants to U.S. institutions, and a database of employment opportunities. Proposed program evaluation and cost factors are also detailed. A large appendix provides a variety of supporting documentation, including meeting agendas, results of interviews, and data on similar programs. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 423 756

Council on International Educational Exchange

PARTIAL SALARY SUPPORT FOR US FACULTY WORKING IN UNIVERSITIES IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

A REPORT TO:

ASSOCIATION LIAISON OFFICE

TO

US AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

By

Henry D. Weaver

IAE 0131 5-31

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Council on International Educational Exchange

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

205 East 42nd Street, New York, NY 10017

I. INTRODUCTION

This is a report of a study undertaken by the Council on International Educational Exchange under an agreement with the Association Liaison Office to the US Agency for International Development Center for University Cooperation in Development.

The purpose of the study has been to examine the feasibility of a program that would provide funds to US faculty to serve in institutions of higher education in less developed countries. The funds would help fill the gap between a reduced salary received from the home institution while on leave and the normal salary of the faculty member, or in cases where the host university pays the salary, the gap between that salary and that of the home institution.

The goal of the proposed program would be to strengthen developing country higher education institutions in their support of economic growth and development within their countries. In pursuing this goal, the program would aim also to strengthen the capacity of participating US institutions in development teaching, research and service.

The study has also been asked to propose operational procedures that would maximize the fulfillment of the goal and to estimate the cost of such a program.

Thanks go to Dr. Joan Claffey for general direction, to CIEE senior staff Edith Katz, Gerry Thompson, John Skillman and Damon Smith for significant amounts of work and to Stuart Richardson for his work as a research associate. The opinions expressed are not official positions of CIEE, but are the responsibility of the author.

Table of Contents

I. Introduction 3

II. Methodology 4

III. Findings From Focus Groups 6

IV. Other Concerns 10

V. Need 12

VI. Supply 14

VII. Benefits and Impacts 16

VIII. Operational Experience 18

IX. Proposed Operational Plan 20

X. Evaluation 31

XI. Cost 32

XII. Bibliography 37

XIII. Appendix 42

II. METHODOLOGY

1. Study of Similar Programs

Information on programs with one or more elements common to the proposal under study have been sought through published reports and interviews. Summaries of interviews are included in the appendix. The programs or organizations consulted were:

UNESCO
Peace Corps
USIA Linkage Program
USAID Linkage Program
Board on Science and Technology for International Development
National Faculty Exchange
Institute for International Education - RISE program
International Executives Service Corps
National Science Foundation
Council for International Exchange of Scholars (operates Fulbright selection)
Overseas Educational Service
American Association of Retired Persons (AARP)
American Association for International Aging (AAIA)
World Bank
International Organization for Migration
National Retired Teachers Association
Volunteers in Technical Training (VITA)

2. Focus Groups

Groups of 12 or 13 people were brought together at three locations: UCLA in Los Angeles, CA, George Washington University in Washington, DC. and Duke University Medical School in Durham, NC. Each group was given a brief statement of the proposal and a suggested list of agenda topics.[1] (See Appendix.) After a brief introduction of each participant and of the proposal, the staff attempted to listen to the comments and concerns of those in attendance.

At each location there was an effort to include representatives of at least one public research university, private research university, small liberal arts college and a historically black university or college. In all three locations this diversity was achieved except that a representative of a historically black institution was present only at the Duke group. In addition individuals were included in one or more of the groups that had experience with faculty placement in South East Asia, Latin America, Africa, the Middle East and in the former Soviet Union and

other East Bloc countries. In Washington the group included representatives of both government and private groups engaged in international exchange activities.

In total these groups involved 37 individuals representing 16 colleges or universities and 5 agencies. A list of attendees and institutions is given in the appendix.[2]

3. ASSOCIATIONS OF FOREIGN UNIVERSITIES

Consultations were made with a number of associations of universities that include members from developing countries or newly emerging democracies. These included:

The Association for South East Asian Institutions of Higher Learning (ASAIHL) for South East Asia, with a secretariat in Bangkok
The Inter-American University Council for Economic and Social Development (CUIDES) for Latin America, with a secretariat in Mexico
The African-American Institute, for African universities, New York office
AMIDEAST for Near East universities, New York offices
International Research and Exchanges Board in Princeton, NJ for information on newly emerging democracies
International Association of Universities, Paris office
International Association of University Presidents, secretariat in Japan

III. FINDINGS FROM FOCUS GROUPS

Following is a summary of opinions that represent the suggestions from these groups. There were of course differences of opinions within each group and between the groups. In the appendix there is a "Group Report" for each group. This represents the material written on a flip chart and usually acknowledged by the group as representing either an individual opinion or a group consensus. In addition there are "Notes" from each group which represent the effort of a staff person to record each person's contribution. In practice, as the underlying interests were explored in the groups some consensus emerged. The following issues represent this consensus from two or more groups:

1. FLEXIBILITY

   This concern was expressed in each group. The possibilities should be wide for the amount of time to be abroad, the nature of the assignment and the exact use of the funds. These issues should be spelled out in each application, but the possibilities for which application could be made should be as open as possible.

   There was concern about the use of the term "topping up" and it became clear that it carried different meanings to different people. Some recalled the former use of the term to indicate funds to increase the salaries of nationals working on development projects and missed the intended use in this case.

2. PRIORITIES MUST BE SET IN THE HOST COUNTRY.

   In one form or another this was also expressed in each group. There was strong feeling that unless the host country and university had a clear idea of what is needed for their development, efforts would likely miss the mark. It was also suggested that helping set priorities might be an area in which US faculty could help. The terms "focus" and "goal setting" came up frequently.

3. SUSTAINED EFFORT

   There was good agreement that an individual US faculty member going on an assignment would be of little value for development purposes unless it was a part of some on going relationship. University to university linkages or at least department to department relationships might be the best way to attain sustainability of the effort. Some commitment by the host university such as providing housing should be an integral part of such a linkage.

4. TWO WAY FLOW

   In two of the groups there was a consensus that either this program should have the possibility for individuals to come to the US or such an opportunity should

be possible in some other associated program. This was considered important for the sustainability of the program. The effectiveness of the University of California program at the University of Nairobi was cited. At present over 50 professors at Nairobi have received doctorates from California as part of an exchange agreement.

5. SHOULD THE GRANTS BE TO INDIVIDUALS OR INSTITUTIONS?

The group at UCLA concluded that it would be best to give the grants to institutions. There would be more direction to the program, greater sustainability and it would be easier to monitor. The other two groups felt it would be better to make the grants to individuals. Although one wants to avoid having faculty go with their own agenda, it is important that they see something in it for themselves. Making the grant to the home university would involve too many delays they felt. They agreed however that it would be important to have home university support in any case.

6. SABBATICAL LEAVES MEAN MANY DIFFERENT THINGS.

In presenting the proposal we spoke about topping up the salary of people on "sabbatical leave". In each group this brought some response. It became clear that "sabbatical leave" means quite different things to people in different circumstances. For faculty in institutions where publication is the *sine qua non* for advancement a sabbatical needs to be time free to do research. This group of institutions includes most major research universities and some prestigious liberal arts colleges. Particularly younger faculty in such institutions will normally find a cost to their careers if they use a sabbatical leave to serve in a university in a developing country. An older faculty member might be able to take such an assignment, but often he or she will have many attractive alternatives. Funds to fill the salary gap may well be what is needed to get these more mature faculty to choose to go to a developing country.

Some institutions, including smaller colleges, many two year institutions and some state universities, simply do not have a sabbatical policy and only in rare cases would an assignment abroad carry with it some salary from the home institution. There is however a sizable number of smaller teaching institutions, particularly a group of good liberal arts colleges that give rewards primarily for teaching and look on sabbatical leaves as a time of faculty development. Funds to fill the gap between sabbatical salary and their normal salaries could well make the difference in their willingness to work in a university in a developing country.

7. APPLICATION PROCEDURES

There was concern, expressed most succinctly by the group at Duke University, that the process for applying for the proposed grants should be relatively simple. The application itself should be short - a maximum of three pages. The peer review process should be fast - completed in less than 6 months. Generally they felt that faculty need almost a year to plan for such leaves, therefore they expressed the hope that once a grant is made there should be a window of a year in which to utilize it.

8. NEED FOR A DATABASE

There was broad agreement that some type of data base should be available to faculty to inform them of opportunities in universities abroad. There was also interest in a database that could list people available for assignments as well. There was a plea that the program not simply create yet another database but that any effort be combined as part of some larger effort of a unified database.

9. DISCIPLINES AND SKILLS NEEDED

When groups were encouraged to name the disciplines that they felt would most help institutions become agents of development, the most frequent response was to emphasize the need for local countries and institutions to determine their own needs. However assuming that caveat, they listed the fields that would most likely be needed. These are listed as they emerged and are not parallel in every case:

Social Sciences
Law and Society
Political Science
Public Policy
Training of leaders and administrators
Assistance in management and priority setting
Counselling
Libraries
English as a second language
Environment
Health and Public Health
Information Transfer
Advanced courses in many fields

The case was also made that enriching the university generally would make it a better instrument for development of the country. It was therefore suggested that no discipline or area of expertise should automatically be excluded.

10. RETIRED PEOPLE

In each group there was discussion about interest that retired people might have in serving overseas. It became clear that retired university personnel represent an important group with interest in working in developing countries. In each group someone approached us after the session to indicate that he or she would be retiring soon and wanted more information about the possibilities. Retired people usually have fewer family restraints such as children or a working spouse, they do not need to produce publications and have some income. Their financial needs would typically be the funds needed to cover rent or house payments.

The disadvantage in using retired people in the proposed program would be that the lack of daily ties to the home department would result in less feedback to the home institution and a less sustained effort by them over a longer period.

IV. OTHER CONCERNS MENTIONED

Many of the concerns that emerged in the Focus Groups were also mentioned in interviews with individuals. In addition several other evaluations from the interviews should be noted.

1. ADEQUATE COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE HOST UNIVERSITY SHOULD BE A PREREQUISITE.

   This concern was stated most eloquently by Dr. Elwin Svenson, Vice Chancellor for Institutional Relations at UCLA. Not only are adequate telecommunications necessary to carry out a timely selection process, but they also are crucial for communication with the home base during the sojourn and are especially important to maintain continuity and sustain the work done after a faculty member returns home.

   The form of the communications can be any one or more of a wide variety of possibilities: Electronic mail by Bitnet or MCI (a clean phone line must be available), telephone, FAX, cellular phone or carrying a disc from a computer to a clean line once a day.

   Dr. Svenson's counsel was that since sufficient funds are not available to do everything, a program should simply not attempt to do anything if the telecommunications are not in a given place. The technology is present to maintain communications anywhere in the world. If a given institution does not have it in place, the first assistance should be to make it available.[3]

   The experience of CIEE staff working with institutions in less developed countries, underscores the correctness of this observation.

2. RELY ON OTHER ENTITIES TO PROVIDE LOGISTICAL SUPPORT.

   The representatives of both the RISE program of IIE and the OES program of the former Education and World Affairs indicated that a major factor related to making their expenses unacceptably high was the cost of providing the logistics of selection, orientation and sending the volunteers abroad.[4]

   Since the proposal under study is intended to supplement other sources of funds and program activities and since a significant number of linkages between US institutions and appropriate foreign universities already exist, it is now appropriate to rely on other groups for these functions.

3. THERE ARE A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF LINKAGES BETWEEN US UNIVERSITIES AND UNIVERSITIES IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES.

Specific identity of many linkages between US institutions and less developed or Eastern European institutions have been identified and are given in the appendix.[5] By region the number discovered is:

Africa and Middle East	178
Central and South America	184
Eastern Europe/Former USSR	333
Asia (South, East, and SE)	121
Total:	816

V. NEED

To determine the need for short term (a year or less) personnel we have contacted organizations of universities in the regions under discussion as well as two international agencies - the International Association of Universities and the International Association of University Presidents. Some of the responses have been in written form and are included in the appendix and others have been verbal. It is clear that these people see a significant need for US university personnel to assist them in the development tasks they can perform for their countries.

For example, Jack Egle, President of CIEE discussed the concept of proposing volunteer faculty for semester or academic year-long posting with the Latin American and Caribbean Universities at the Inter-American University Council for Economic and Social Development (CUIDES) conference in Vina del Mar, Chile in December 1991. Some 85 Rectors and Presidents participating in the discussion not only expressed keen interest in participating as host institutions for the volunteers, but indicated their willingness and ability to provide assistance in the form of housing and other amenities. Mr. Egle indicated that the favorable response was much stronger than he had anticipated.

Dr. Maurice Harari, Dean of the Center for International Education of California State University, Long Beach responded to a question regarding the need for such a program by affirming the need abroad and then adding: "I would find this possibility an extremely desirable one at both ends. For those returning to their home institution this contribution to the internationalization of US higher education would be very substantial." [6]

Over the last couple years the author and senior staff at CIEE have discussed the need for US personnel to fill short term faculty needs with the heads of at least 25 universities in Africa, the Near East, Latin America, South East Asia and the former Eastern Bloc. In every case we have received strong expressions of interest in the idea.

Trevor Coombe in his 1991 study for the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, *A Consultation on Higher Education in Africa*, makes the important point (p7) that "Diversity reigns in the African university community..."[7] The needs in one African university are not necessarily the same as those in another one. On a global scale this is even more clear. The needs of universities in the newly emerging democracies are likely to be significantly different than those of universities in Africa or Latin America. This underscores the need for flexibility in the program.

Coombe indicated a number of significant needs and some of these suggest possibilities for universities in many places. He reports being told repeatedly (p3) "...that the universities' gravest problem is to retain able staff." This suggests that USAID might make activities that would assist in that retention a high priority at least in awarding grants to send US personnel to African universities. There are many ways that could be accomplished, but here are a couple of suggestions. The US personnel might:

a) teach undergraduate courses in universities to reduce impossible loads such as those brought about at the University of Nairobi by a double intake of students. A similar need exists in the University of Buenos Aires where admission policies result in large teaching loads.

b) teach advanced courses to fill in gaps where qualified local personnel are not available. This could be done in some cases with the "Hiram Plan" approach by which students take only one course for 3 or 4 weeks.

c) take part of the load of a local professor so that he or she would have adequate time to do research. If the US professor could in addition assist in the research so much the better.

d) take the full load of a local professor so that he or she could have a sabbatical leave for research at home and/or to take part in some refresher courses abroad. Some USAID funding could well be tied to the grant to cover the local professor's costs.

In addition to the universities in the countries under discussion, there are in many cases research institutes that should be given support. For example in Africa there is the International Centre of Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE), the African Academy of Sciences and Network of African Scientific Organizations to name a few. In Latin America good research and teaching is being carried out by the Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences (FLACSO) and in Eastern European countries the Academies of Science are in many cases in real need.

The disciplines of need suggested in the report of the focus groups all apply in one place or another. Coombe singles out management, law, library science and information services as especially important in African universities.

The IREX task force on Romania recommended that (p14) "...management and entrepreneurship training, environmental studies and research and establishment of electronic communication with academic institutions in Western Europe and the US (Bitnet) now being developed in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland be considered for Romania and other southern-tier countries." They also commented (p3) "We found, wherever we went, an intense need for meaningful association with the rest of the world, for easy and regular links with professional colleagues overseas, for access to current information and publications. These needs and yearnings characterize most of the countries in the area."[8]

VI. SUPPLY

At best one can only estimate the interest of US faculty in taking part in such a program. In discussions in the Focus Groups and on an individual basis there emerged a significant difference between larger and smaller institutions in the availability of faculty and the degree to which funds to supplement other sources would affect decisions.

For institutions with less than 300 faculty members we have assumed that for appointments of a semester or longer an average of 10% of the faculty would be willing to use two leaves for such service during an academic career. This would vary from perhaps 2% of the faculty to up to 50% of the faculty in institutions we know. For shorter periods including appointments in the summer we assume that 25% of the faculty would be interested once every five years.

For institutions with 300 or more faculty we have assumed that for appointments of a semester or longer an average of 3% of the faculty would be willing to use one leave for such service during an academic career. This would vary from 1% to 10% depending on the institutional culture. For shorter periods including appointments in the summer we assume that 10% of the faculty would be interested once every five years.

According to Peterson's Guides as reproduced in The World Almanac for 1992[9] there are among the institutions offering 4 year degrees or higher and with an enrollment of 750 or more a total of 885 institutions with less than 300 faculty members having a total of 123,835 faculty. For institution with 300 or more faculty there are 476 institutions with a total faculty of 407,959. Putting these data with the assumptions above leads to the following supply:

For appointments of a semester or longer:

Smaller institutions	710
Larger institutions	350
Total	1,060

For shorter appointments:

Smaller institutions	6,190
Larger institutions	8,160
Total	14,350

In addition there would be a significant supply available from two year institutions.

As a reality test the assumptions can be applied to an institution with 150 faculty members. Between 0.2 and 4 faculty would be available in a given year for long term appointment and an average of 7.5 would be available for short term appointment. For an institution of 1000 faculty members between 0.3 and 2.5 faculty would be available in a given year for long term appointment and 20 per year would be available for short term assignments. These seem in the ball park.

If the assumptions are anywhere near correct, the limitation for the program will likely be funds available rather than faculty interest.

Further evidence of interest by US faculty in work abroad is that 3,229 people applied for Fulbright awards in 1991-92 according to the 1991 Annual Report of the Fulbright Scholar Program.[10]

VII. BENEFITS AND IMPACTS

1. TYPES OF BENEFITS AND IMPACTS

The types of benefits and impacts which are likely to result from facilitating the placement of US faculty in developing country HEIs will vary widely by country. At the individual level in Africa the predominant benefit would likely be in personnel renewal and development. Freedom to pursue research would be the primary advantage to individuals in SE Asia, Latin America and the former East Bloc countries.

In all countries the institutions would gain instruction from people with recent access to literature in their field and often courses they are not usually able to offer. This would lead to significant curricular and research efforts related to particular development problems of the country involved.

From the US side, a returning faculty member would bring an increased world view and understanding of issues from another cultural viewpoint. In many cases objectives of the American institution could also be met. For example there are many linkages between US institutions sending students abroad and universities in developing countries. It is often difficult to find an exchange component that is useful to the host university. Placing faculty to teach host country students in the host university has often been seen by host university officials as a valuable asset. This can be a significant advantage to the US institution in working out a lasting exchange agreement.

2. INFLUENCING FACTORS

The factors which influence benefits and impacts for faculty sojourners will usually be the adjustment of the US faculty person to the host environment, the appropriateness of the expertise he or she brings and the length of the sojourn.

3. SUSTAINABILITY

The sustainability of the benefits or impacts after the exchange activity has terminated will depend on factors that continue the positive activities that took place during the sojourn. If the visit gets a reasonable research activity underway and the local conditions allow it to continue, the momentum can be preserved. Most frequently in past experience, the long term connection between a specific department (in a larger institution) or the total institution (for smaller institutions) has been the thing that has sustained efforts begun in a shorter visit. For this reason it is recommended that the use of existing linkages be given a high priority in awarding grants.

4. CANDIDATE SCREENING AND SELECTION

There are several criteria on which candidates would be screened and selected. First, the person must have the particular skills required for the tasks to be done. Second, there must be some assurance that the person can make the cultural adjustment required in relocating. Prior experience of satisfactorily working in another culture is often a good indicator. If the experience in another culture is not present, a short assignment should be considered. Third, a clear and specific understanding of who locally will direct the person is of utmost importance. Since local discernment of development needs is critical it becomes important to ascertain if the proposed visitor can comfortably work within the direction set forth.

5. DIVERSITY OF CANDIDATES

There would not seem to be a likelihood that a faculty exchange program would increase the role in development of women, or people from diverse cultural, ethnic and racial backgrounds unless this goal is explicitly put forward in the design of the program and as a priority for selection. One suggestion is to deliberately earmark part of the grants for Africa to be given through Historically Black Colleges and Universities. A deliberate effort to recruit women should be built in to achieve better diversity not only by the sending institutions, but also to increase the consciousness of host institutions on this issue.

VIII. OPERATIONAL EXPERIENCE

The organizations we consulted had a wide range of operational methods for getting faculty placed in foreign institutions. To put their experience in perspective we might break down the various elements that must be in place for a US faculty member to go to a host institution of higher learning in a developing country as follows:

1. INFORMATION OF OPPORTUNITY:

   The faculty member must become aware of the need in the host institution abroad.

2. ACCEPTANCE PROCEDURE:

   The faculty member and the host institution must become sufficiently informed about each other that each party decides to move ahead with the placement. Particularly if the incoming personnel become a part of the faculty of the host institution the usual requirement that the host institution itself must make the decision becomes important.

3. LOGISTICS:

   Someone must handle the logistics of getting the faculty member (and family if involved) on site abroad. This includes (but is not limited to) providing information about the tasks to be performed, providing information about the living conditions and culture abroad, arranging for housing abroad, arranging for visas, transportation, insurance, inoculations and reception upon arrival.

4. FINANCES:

   Sufficient financial resources need to be available to provide salary, transportation and incidental costs. Any or all of these might come from the individual's personal resources, the host institution or a granting agency.

5. DIRECTION:

   Someone in the host institution must be designated to direct the work of the faculty member and to assist with logistics upon arrival.

The Peace Corps, Fulbright program, International Executives Service Corps and the former OES provide all five of the elements listed above, except that the person involved receives much lower compensation than normal. This assures the best quality control and also is the most expensive to operate.

The National Faculty Exchange provides the first two - information and an acceptance procedure.

The RISE program of IIE provided primarily information, but part of the overwhelming load that caused its cessation was the time demand on staff to provide additional information needed for placement and part of the logistics.

IX. PROPOSED OPERATIONAL PLAN FOR PARTIAL SALARY SUPPORT OF US FACULTY WORKING IN UNIVERSITIES IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

A. ELEMENTS IN OPERATIONAL PLAN

The program proposed by AID is primarily a grant program and therefore should focus on providing part of the finances needed to make the placement of a faculty member possible. The proposal that follows assumes that this program will deal with (1) information about opportunities and (4) part of the finances but will not handle the other elements: an acceptance procedure, logistics or direction. In this way it needs to supplement resources from other programs. The program will of course need to select the grant recipients, but the procedure suggested assumes that the selection of the faculty member by the host institution is done in some other way. Since only two of the elements of a placement will be involved by the program it is important that the program be designed with flexibility to adapt to a variety of circumstances.

We have evaluated carefully the ideas received in consultations and interviews and recommend that the operational plan needs to address the following elements:

1. FLEXIBILITY

The needs of institutions in less developed countries vary greatly, not only from country to country, but also within a given country. Likewise the role a US faculty person can fill will vary greatly in terms of his or her expertise, the amount of time needed and the kind of continued connection required. Therefore this operational plan assumes that a large variety of proposals will qualify. The common elements will be that proposals will be (a) for partial salary support of a US faculty member or administrator and (b) the proposal will make the host institution better able to serve development needs in the host country.

The length of time that a US faculty person will be supported can vary from a week or two up to a year. The shortest times would be applicable to someone who has previously worked with the institution abroad and is sustaining the previous effort by a short visit or to someone with such outstanding expertise that a unique contribution, such as a series of lectures or direction of research can be made in a short time.

If the US person does not lose any salary by the visit, then no AID funds would be expended for salary, but funds for travel, books and for assisting a local person could still be available.

A maximum of $20,000 in partial salary support of a US person would be available for an academic year of 9 months and the maximum salary support for a shorter period would be a pro rata share of $20,000 based on the actual number of months. In no case would it exceed 25% of the person's normal academic year salary.

Some support for a host university professor should be allowable if it related directly to the service of the US person in the host institution. It is not envisioned that this would involve host professors teaching in US institutions but rather it would allow the host university professor to visit the US institution involved for special orientation in a joint research project or a special training session. Or such support might cover additional expenses needed to allow time off for the host professor to do research at the host university. Any salary paid to the host national would be at the rate normally received from the host institution. This might also cover travel expense. A maximum of $10,000 for an academic year is suggested. For purposes of budget, we assume that an average of $5,000 would apply.

There needs to be flexibility in the type of US university personnel to whom grants are made. There are frequently special needs for development of libraries or communication resources. In many cases retired people would be admirably situated to give the service needed. If a retired person has a full retirement pay including Social Security than no additional salary should be given. However many faculty are now taking early retirement and some are delaying acceptance of Social Security benefits until age 65 since taking earlier payments from Social Security adversely affects the amount of such payments for later years. AID funds could be used to fill that gap. Normally a host university should be expected to provide housing for a visiting professional, but there may be cases in which supplemental support for special housing or special living costs should be provided. A maximum of $20,000 or 25% of the retired person's highest salary while working should apply.

Retired people would have a special responsibility to indicate how they would remain related to the project. This often could be through a given department. In general they would be above departmental politics and might be in a better position to define the nature of a continued relationship and to carry it out. The continued relationship might be with their former department or with another department or institution.

2. Sustained Collaboration

A key element in awarding a grant needs to be a judgment of whether the advantage of the service by the US faculty person can be sustained over a number of years. This can be done in a variety of ways and the burden of proof that it will likely follow should rest with the applicant for the grant.

The most significant indication that collaboration might be sustained is the existence of an active, ongoing relationship between the host institution and the sending institution. Therefore priority would be given to assignments that are part of an existing partnership or linkage between a US institution and an institution in a developing country. This might be a formal linkage contract between institutions or departments or it might be a continued relationship between two people. Individual relationships between US professors and former students are frequently productive. Joint research growing out of previous relationships can be sustainable if it can be given direction.

Multiple year grants that are subject to review each year before actually granting the funds of subsequent years can be crucial in maintaining an effort. An initial period in the host university followed by annual or semi-annual shorter visits by a US person can be most productive. In other cases a shorter visit for a short course or consultation on research may be the first year effort. That would give both the host institution and the US professor an opportunity to evaluate if a longer stay would be productive. In such a case evidence would need to be forthcoming before the second year grant is paid. It is recommended that multiple year grants up to three years in length be awarded.

3. Priorities of the Host Country

Each applicant needs to demonstrate that the proposal will lead to the host institution's being better able to assist its country in development. As indicated on pages 12 and 13 we have received strong expressions from university people in developing countries that the assistance of US professionals is needed. Further, as mentioned on page 16, the particular expertise needed varies greatly by country and institution. Obviously one cannot prescribe in advance exactly how a determination of priorities of development will be made in a given country, but essential to demonstrating that this condition is met will be some evidence that (a) the country in question or some body which has given the question careful study recognizes certain needs for development and (b) some argument that the particular activity proposed helps the host institution to meet one or more of these needs.

4. COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Experience is clear that if basic telecommunication facilities are lacking the probability of a successful assignment being set up and carried out is low. Further, adequate communication facilities are crucial for sustained efforts. Therefore it should be a *sine qua non* for any grant that the applicant indicates what telecommunication facilities are operative. Since information from the host university is essential in the application the presence of that information will become collaborative evidence that the facilities exist.

5. UNIVERSITY ACCEPTANCE PROCESS

On page 18 we have given five elements that need to be in place for a US faculty person to have a successful placement in a foreign university. This proposal speaks to part of numbers (1) (getting information about opportunities) and (4) (finances). This section and the next two speak to the other three points.

In most cases we are dealing with faculty appointments for short periods of time. In less developed countries just as in developed countries it is essential for a university faculty to maintain control on who becomes a part of that faculty, even for short periods. Consequently in the final analysis the host institution must act on the acceptance of the guest faculty person. Institutions do this in a variety of ways and a part of the application for a grant needs to spell out what the acceptance procedure will be. In some cases the institution may delegate a person or a partner institution in the US to interview and/or advise them about the candidate. In a few cases they may rely on references and a phone call or other means of information. Especially for this function good communication facilities are essential. It is not proposed that AID enter directly into this process, but that it have evidence that the process has occurred or will occur.

6. LOGISTICS

Likewise it is recommended that AID not become directly involved in the logistics of orientation and transportation of the grantee to the assignment. However it is essential that the applicant give evidence that someone will handle this task. When partnership arrangements are in place the partnership institution in the US will frequently be in good position to carry out this function. In some cases the individual will have had previous experience that makes it possible for the host institution to carry out this function directly by using its telecommunication facilities.

In some cases a third party may need to be involved in providing the logistic support. For example a university with an unrelated partnership arrangement with the host university may be in a position to provide logistic support and since the activity of the grant would not relate directly to its normal function some payment for the service would need to be made. An example of this would be a university with a student exchange program that agrees to provide logistic support for a visiting professor from another campus.

7. DIRECTION ON THE FIELD

Many a visiting faculty person has given much less than expected because no one seemed in charge upon arrival. It is simply necessary for the prospective host university to indicate to what person the visitor will report.

8. MANAGEMENT PLAN

The management of the grant might be done directly by AID or by a contractual arrangement with an outside organization. The operation of the selection process for the Fulbright program by CIES is an illustration of the latter approach. We are not in a position to suggest which would best serve the needs of AID in this case.

There are some procedures however that we do recommend should be followed:

a. There needs to be a person responsible for the operation and management of the program.

b. It would not appear to be cost-effective to convene separate panels of peers to recommend applicants based on expertise in one case and meeting the needs of the country in the other case. Therefore it is recommended that copies of the application be sent to two or three referees who would be asked to comment only on the professional competence for the work outlined of the person applying for the grant. Such referees should be given a maximum time of two weeks in which to reply.

c. Panels of peers should be convened for each of 4 regions: Africa and the Middle East, Central and South America, Eastern Europe and former states of the USSR and Asia. If the number of applications is less than 50 for any one region, regions might be combined. It is suggested that applications be limited to 15 pages. If the number of applications exceeds 100 for a given region, the region might be divided. Panels might consist of three or four members: One with experience in one or more university in the area, one with knowledge of development activities and at least one additional person with experience living in a less developed country. Each panel would evaluate the application in light of the criteria given and recommend to the staff which should be accepted.

d. Final decisions for awarding the grants should be done by staff as followed in usual AID policy.

9. FINANCIAL NEEDS OF AWARDEES

There are several specific recommendations for the grants that need a bit more explanation.

a. We are recommending that benefits associated with the part of salary paid by AID that are not normally covered by the home institution should be covered. For example the employer's part of FICA would probably never be covered for funds channeled to the individual from another source. If the arrangement with the individual makes the amount of funds received from the home institution less than 50% many institutions will drop health insurance, life insurance and similar benefits.

b. The costs of carrying out the logistics for placement of the candidate are significant and we are recommending that $1,000 be paid to the entity providing that service. The example previously cited of a university with an exchange program for students with the overseas institution might serve this function but would have no other incentive to do so if there was no compensation for the appreciable work involved. The biggest cost is staff time with communication expense not far behind. An estimate of the cost for the logistics per student placed by the University of California Education Abroad Program is $1,000. (Note that this amount provides for 3-5 days of staff time, depending on the level of the staff person involved.) If a person outside the usual channels of communication is involved it would probably take more special staff time and cost something greater than this amount. Obviously this cost is about the same regardless of the length of the assignment.

c. A displacement allowance for individuals going abroad is common practice in academia. Most institutions arrive at some standard amount and let the individual make the decisions about the best way to handle a specific need. For example the person may choose to ship additional clothing or to buy new upon arrival. Passports, visas and international phone calls all cost. Preventive inoculations and special medications such as antimalarial drugs are usually not covered by health insurance plans and have risen markedly in cost within the last few years. One can reimburse on actual cost but the staff time to monitor and reimburse these becomes very large. Several colleges and universities have been using $1,000 for the last 20 to 25 years and counsel us that it should be raised, especially in light of increased medical preparation costs. We are therefore recommending that a displacement allowance of $1,500 be used for a year assignment.

The displacement allowance is somewhat dependent on the length of the assignment. Special medications depend on the amount of time gone, but inoculation, passport and visa costs are the same regardless of the length of stay. We are therefore suggesting a step scale as follows:

Less than 2 months	$ 500
2 months, but less than 4 months	750
4 months, but less than 6 months	1,000
6 months or longer	1,500

d. Almost without exception, faculty we have known who have served in universities in less developed countries have returned and marshaled their colleagues to donate excess journals and books. There is almost always a need for funds to ship the material. Up to $1,000 is suggested as an appropriate amount. Payment would be for the actual cost so that this simply becomes an upper limit.

Given the counsel received in the focus groups and in personal interviews with a variety of people experienced in the moving of faculty abroad, it is recommended that this plan proceed with three components:

B. GRANTS TO INDIVIDUALS

Approximately half of the funds available for placing US faculty in universities should be awarded to US faculty as individuals. An annual competition should be held in which the applicant demonstrates:

1. That he or she has applied for a position in one or more universities in a developing country, what the procedure for acceptance will be and that adequate telecommunications exist in the institution.

2. That the position will lead to the host institution's being better able to assist its country in development.

3. How the benefits to development of his or her participation will be sustained after the faculty member returns home.

4. Who will handle the logistics involved in going to the assignment and to whom the individual will be responsible during the assignment.

5. What salary or other funds the individual will have available from other sources and how much additional salary is requested from AID. This request should include funds to cover the cost of benefits normally paid to the individual by the home institution.

6. What the costs for round trip transportation for the faculty member and accompanying family members will be.

7. Justification for any other expenses requested as a part of the grant.

These grants to individuals could be awarded either directly by AID or by some appropriate organization which would contract with AID to provide the service. Payment for salary and benefits would normally be made to the individual's home institution with other parts of the grant going to the appropriate person or organization as indicated in the application.

Items that could be included in the grants, depending on the needs indicated, would be:

1. Up to 25% of the individual's normal salary, not exceeding $20,000, if it is not being provided from some other source.

2. Benefits associated with salary not covered by the home institution on the amount of salary paid by AID.

3. A standard allotment of $1,000, to an organization providing logistic support to the individual.

4. A displacement allowance of $1,500 for a year assignment, made to the individual to cover costs of items such as passports, visas, inoculations and excess baggage.

5. An allotment of up to $1,000 to cover the cost of shipping books or periodicals to the host institution after completion of a period of service.

6. Round trip transportation for the individual and also for accompanying spouse if the assignment is for more than six weeks. If the assignment is for 6 months or longer round trip transportation would be paid for up to two additional dependents who accompany the applicant for the full period.

7. Up to $10,000 to be used to assist the professor in the host institution with whom the person will be working.

C. GRANTS TO US INSTITUTIONS OR DEPARTMENTS

Approximately half the funds should be made available for grants to institutions or departments. Priority should be given to those that have existing linkages with universities in developing countries. The linkages might be by departments, schools or the whole institution. Existing working linkages represent one of the most solid promises of sustainability of a project. This would bring a significant multiplier effect to linkage programs that are otherwise being funded by the institution or by grants for such partnership programs funded by AID, USIA, NSF, NIH, UNESCO, the world bank, or other sources.

The applications for these grants would need to demonstrate:

1. That the partner university in the developing country had identified one or more positions to be filled by a faculty member from the US as helping the host institution to better assist in the development of its country and that adequate telecommunications are in place.

2. How the benefits to development of sending a US faculty member to the host institution will be sustained after the faculty member returns home.

3. That the applying university is willing and able to handle the logistics involved in sending an individual to the assignment.

4. What the costs for round trip transportation for the faculty member and accompanying family members will be.

5. Justification for any other expenses requested as a part of the grant.

Before a grant is given to the institution it would need to communicate what salary or other funds the individual chosen will have available from other sources and how much additional salary is requested from AID. This request should include funds to cover the cost of benefits normally paid to the individual by the home institution that will not be covered by the home institution.

These grants to institutions could be awarded either directly by AID or by some appropriate organization which would contract with AID to provide the service. Payment for salary and benefits would normally be made to the individual's home institution with other parts of the grant going to the institution applying.

Items that could be included in the grants, depending on the needs indicated, would be:

1. Up to 25% of the individual's normal salary, not exceeding $20,000, if it is not being provided from some other source.

2. Benefits associated with salary not covered by the home institution on the amount of salary paid by AID.

3. A payment to the applying institution of $1,000 to cover the cost of logistics.

4. A displacement allowance of $1,500 for a year assignment, to be paid by the applying institution to the individual to cover costs of items such as passports, visas, inoculations and excess baggage.

5. An allotment of up to $1,000 to cover the cost of shipping books or periodicals to the host institution after completion of a period of service.

6. Round trip transportation for the individual and also for accompanying spouse if the assignment is for more than six weeks. If the assignment is for 6 months or longer round trip transportation would be paid for up to two additional dependents who accompany the applicant for the full period.

7. Up to $10,000 to be used to assist the professor in the host institution with whom the person will be working.

D. PARTICIPATION IN A DATABASE FOR INFORMATION

Crucial to a successful program will be the ability of interested faculty to become aware of opportunities in universities abroad. One of the pleas heard in the focus groups was to avoid further multiplication of lists of opportunities and data bases. We have been advised to if possible make the available openings and funding known through more universal listings.

The problem is one that will be even more apparent five years from now that it is at present. Many organizations are setting up databases for many different purposes. In the field of opportunities abroad as well as in many other fields this causes a decrease in effectiveness since there is no place to go for information. A database should be used that is not simply listing AID possibilities, but one that is operated with listings from a wide variety of sources and for different purposes. To illustrate the problems of maintaining a more limited database, USIA has expressed interest in using the more general listings proposed by CIEE and reported that they have difficulty keeping their own listings current.

A database such as the united international base now being developed by the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE) could meet this need. Once in place, this database will be self supporting with income coming from a modest listing fee paid by institutions seeking faculty or faculty seeking to volunteer. A proposal from CIEE or any other organization seeking to operate such a database could include two components. First would be a development grant to help cover the start up costs of such a database. Second would be an annual grant to pay the listing fees for institutions in developing countries who demonstrate that the position(s) for which they are seeking personnel will lead to their better serving in the development of their countries.

To give a better idea of what a united database might look like, see the information on the International Network of University Volunteers that is proposed by CIEE.[11] Once operating this database will be available at no cost to institutions or individuals that wish to use it. It will operate on listing fees from those making the listing and funds from AID could be dispersed by CIEE or some other organization, to meet the needs of institutions that lack the hard currency for even a modest fee.

These latter grants for listing fees (which would probably be under $200 per listing) should have the stipulation that the institution benefiting would demonstrate that some adequate provision existed to handle the logistics of placement of incoming personnel. Adequate provision for handling logistics would simply be to specify an organization or department within the host university that has the experience in providing such logistics.

X. EVALUATION

There are two levels of evaluation that should be built into the program. The first is an evaluation of each placement during the first three years and then a sampling of placements in subsequent years. It is recommended that this have three points of input. The person giving direction on the field, the participant and someone responsible for continuation of the effort. Either, a simple questionnaire with open ended possibilities or a request for response to several questions would be appropriate. For example one could ask the person directing the volunteer to comment on the performance and interaction with colleagues of the visitor, to indicate in what ways the experience had or would lead to development activities in the country and to comment on the activities to be continued from the experience. The director of the program would need to engage someone to outline the exact questions and questionnaires to be used in such an evaluation, to send out the questionnaires and to tabulate and interpret the results. This would perhaps represent a quarter time responsibility for a competent professional and might best be sub-contracted to an appropriate research professional within a university.

There should also be a planned evaluation of the program after three years. This could be done in a variety of ways but would surely take into account the individual evaluations. It would be the time to determine if both institution and individual grants should continue and if so what mix of the two is best.

The criterion for judging success has been implicitly stated in the purpose of the proposal. That is, has the activity better prepared an institution or part of an institution in a less developed country to assist its country in the development process? There are several inputs that should be sought to answer that question. First, in anticipation of this program evaluation, questions should be placed in the individual evaluations that would yield data of use for this study. The person giving direction on the field, the participant and the person with responsibility for sustained effort in each case should be asked, either by open-ended questions or by a structured response, to speak to the effect of the activity in making the host institution better able to assist its country in development. Second, an independent opinion should be sought from people involved in development planning for the country on whether or not the activity has been on target for development priorities and has been useful. Since development is the principle role of AID country offices, these would be logical places to consult for this independent opinion or to suggest people qualified to answer the question.

Since much of the data for making the program evaluation can be collected in the process of making individual evaluations, the same person should be engaged to carry out that study at the end of three years. This might be the equivalent of a summer study for a university professor.

XI. COST

Estimated costs are given for programs of 1 month, 3 months, 6 months and a full academic year. This is not intended to limit the options for length of stay, but rather to give costs for different ranges. In addition separate costs are indicated for retired people who would not need any additional salary support. The cost of each part is calculated separately.

1. INDIVIDUAL OR INSTITUTIONAL GRANTS, FULL ACADEMIC YEAR:

	Provided by AID	Provided by Participants Home Inst.	Provided by Host Inst.
Salary	$20,000	(1)	Housing
Benefits @ 30%	6,000	30% of above	-
Logistic support	1,000	-	-
Displacement	1,500	-	-
Shipping books	1,000	-	-
Transportation (spouse+2 dep)	12,000	-	-
Host university support	5,000	(2)	(3)
Insurance	1,000	-	-
Total	$47,500		

2. INDIVIDUAL OR INSTITUTIONAL GRANTS, FOR SIX MONTHS:

Salary	$13,333	(1)	Housing
Benefits @ 30%	4,000	30% of above	-
Logistic support	1,000	-	-
Displacement	1,500	-	-
Shipping books	1,000	-	-
Transportation (spouse+2 dep)	12,000	-	-
Host university support	5,000	(2)	(3)
Insurance	1,000	-	-
Total	$38,883		

Note: (1) - 50% - 66% of normal salary
(2) - access to research and courses
(3) - normal support

	Provided by AID	Provided by Participants Home Inst.	Provided by Host Inst.
3. **INDIVIDUAL OR INSTITUTIONAL GRANTS, FOR 3 MONTHS:**			
Salary	6,667	(1)	Housing
Benefits @ 30%	2,000	30% of above	-
Logistic support	1,000	-	-
Displacement costs	750	-	-
Shipping books	1,000	-	-
Transportation (vol.+ spouse)	6,000	-	-
Host university support	5,000	(2)	(3)
Insurance	333	-	-
Total	22,750		
4. **INDIVIDUAL OR INSTITUTIONAL GRANTS OF 1 MONTH:**			
Salary	2,222	normal salary	Housing
Benefits (FICA)	170	30% salary	-
Logistic support	1,000		-
Displacement costs	500	-	-
Shipping books	1,000	-	-
Transportation (vol. only)	3,000	-	-
Host university support	5,000	(1)	(2)
Insurance	111	-	-
Total	13,003		

Note: (1) - 50% - 66% of normal salary
(2) - access to research and courses
(3) - normal support

5. **FOR INDIVIDUAL GRANTS FOR RETIRED PERSON:**
(Same as for regular faculty less salary and benefits)

A. Academic year	21,500
B. 6 months	21,500
C. 3 months	14,083
D. 1 month	10,611

6. **DATABASE DEVELOPMENT**

For development of a database one can assume that there might need to be a three year grant. During the first year it would cover 1/3 time of a professional and full time of an assistant. Additional expense would be for communications, supplies and publicity. This would amount to about $98,000. The second year would need about half that amount and the third year a quarter of the amount. By the end of the three years the database should be self financing on the basis of a small fee for listing. This would lead to:

First year	$98,000
Second year	49,000
Third year	24,000

For annual allotments to needy institutions for listing on a database, one can assume that for each individual or institutional grant there would be funds to list two institutional opportunities. This is estimated at:

For each faculty grant	$400

7. **SELECTION OF VOLUNTEER:**

Per person:	$2,000

8. **COST OF EVALUATION.**

A. For evaluation of individuals (Based on 100 participants):

Salary for professional	$15,000
Printing, mailing and communication	4,000
Computer time for analysis	1,000
Secretarial services (25% time)	9,000
Total:	$29,000

8. COST OF EVALUATION (CONT.).

B. For evaluation of program - end of 3rd year:

Salary for professional	$13,333
Printing, mailing and communication	5,000
Computer time for analysis	1,000
Secretarial services (2 months @ full time)	8,000
Total:	$27,333

FOUR YEAR BUDGET

Assume that 100 grants are given with 25 each being for periods of 1 month, 3 months, 6 months and 9 months. The break down between regular faculty and retired faculty is given in the chart. It is assumed that half of these grants are individual and half are institutional.

	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	4th Year
10 yr/reg.fac. @ 47,500	475,000	475,000	475,000	475,000
15 yr/retiree @ 21,500	322,500	322,500	322,500	322,500
10 6-mo/reg.fac. @ 38,833	388,333	388,333	388,333	388,333
15 6-mo/retiree @ 21,500	322,500	322,500	322,500	322,500
15 3-mo./reg.fac.@ 22,750	341,250	341,250	341,250	341,250
10 3-mo./retiree @ 14,083	140,083	140,083	140,083	140,083
25 1-mo. @ 13,003	325,075	325,075	325,075	325,075
Database development	98,000	49,000	24,000	---
Database listings	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
Evaluation of individuals	29,000	29,000	29,000	29,000
Evaluation of program	---	---	---	27,883
Selection of grantees	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
TOTAL:	$2,681,741	2,632,741	2,607,741	2,611,574

XII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

XII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Agenda for US-AID Feasibility Study Focus Group Meetings. (Appendix A)

2. List of Focus Group attendees. (Appendix B)

3. Notes from a meeting with Elwin Svenson, Vice-Chancellor for Institutional Relations, UCLA. Notes by Henry D. Weaver. August 4, 1992. (Appendix U)

4. Notes from conversations with Sandra Cerverra of the Institute of International Education. Notes by Edith S. Katz, Assistant Executive Director of CIEE. (Appendix I)

5. Memo to Henry D. Weaver summarizing number of existing linkages between US institutions and institutions in developing countries/newly emerging democracies. (Appendix W)

6. Notes from conversations with Maurice Harari, Dean of the Center for International Education of California State University, Long Beach. Notes by Henry D. Weaver. August 4, 1992. (Appendix V)

7. Coombe, Trevor, A Consultation on Higher Education in Africa. Published by The Department of International and Comparative Education, Institute of Education, University of London, January 1991.

8. Barnes, Harry, (Chairman), IREX Task Force on Romania, Report and Recommendations. August 1990. Princeton, NJ.

9. The World Almanac and Book of Facts. Pages 220-235. Published by Phearos Books, New York, New York, 1991.

10. Fulbright Scholar Program 1991 Annual Report. Council for the International Exchange of Scholars, Washington, D.C. 1992.

11. International Network of University Volunteers - program description. Council on International Educational Exchange. New York, 1992. (Appendix 2-D)

12. Opportunities in Africa. Pages 16-19. Published by the African-American Institute, New York, New York, 1992.

13. Kirk, Mary E., Where Walls Once Stood. Institute of International Education, New York, 1992.

14. Group Report for Focus Group Meeting for AID Feasibility Study at University of California, Los Angeles, July 15, 1992. Notes by Henry D. Weaver. (Appendix C)

BIBLIOGRAPHY-2

15. Group Report for Focus Group Meeting for AID Feasibility Study at George Washington University, Washington, D.C., July 21, 1992. Notes by Henry D. Weaver. (Appendix D)

16. Group Report for Focus Group Meeting for AID Feasibility Study at Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina, July 23, 1992. Notes by Henry D. Weaver. (Appendix E)

17. Notes from Focus Group Meeting for AID Feasibility Study at University of California, Los Angeles, July 15, 1992. Notes by Stuart Richardson, CIEE. (Appendix F)

18. Notes from Focus Group Meeting for AID Feasibility Study at George Washington University, Washington, D.C., July 21, 1992. Notes by Stuart Richardson. (Appendix G)

19. Notes from Focus Group Meeting for AID Feasibility Study at Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina, July 23, 1992. Notes by Stuart Richardson, CIEE. (Appendix H)

20. Notes from a meeting with Pam Prochnow and Kim Rowe of the Peace Corps. Notes by Edith S. Katz, Assistant Executive Director of CIEE. (Appendix J)

21. Notes from conversations with Bette Worley, President, National Faculty Exchange. Notes by Edith S. Katz, Assistant Executive Director of CIEE. (Appendix K)

22. Notes from a meeting with Vivian Abbott and Beata Dafeldecker of International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX). Notes by Stuart Richardson, CIEE. June 30, 1992. (Appendix L)

23. Notes from a meeting with Ralph Nachtrieb of USIA. Notes by Stuart Richardson, CIEE. July 20, 1992. (Appendix M)

24. Notes from a conversations with Cassandra Pyle of the Center for the International Exchange of Scholars. Notes by Stuart Richardson, CIEE. July 21, 1992. (Appendix N)

25. Notes from a meeting with Leonard Haynes of USIA. Notes by Stuart Richardson, CIEE. July 22, 1992. (Appendix O)

26. Notes from a conversation with Neil Brandis of the Board on Science and Technology for International Development. Notes by Stuart Richardson, CIEE. July 30, 1992. (Appendix P)

27. Notes from a meeting with Mr. Colin Power of UNESCO. Notes by Stuart Richardson, CIEE. July 30, 1992. (Appendix Q)

28. Notes from conversations with Dr. Leslie Nucho, of AMIDEAST. Notes by Stuart Richardson, CIEE. August 3, 1992. (Appendix R)

29. Notes from conversations with Dr. Winnie Emoungu of USIA. Notes by Stuart Richardson, CIEE. August 4, 1992. (Appendix S)

30. Notes from a meeting with Dr. Jane Marten, of the African-American Institute. Notes by Stuart Richardson, CIEE. August 5, 1992. (Appendix T)

31. Letter from Leslie Nucho, Director, Information Services, AMIDEAST. (Appendix X)

32. FY 1991 Cooperative Agreement Awards, University Development Linkages Project. Agency for International Development - Center for University Cooperation in Development. (Appendix Y)

33. University Affiliations Program, Director of Grants 1982 - 1991. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. (Appendix Z)

34. The Whole World Handbook 1992-93. Council on International Educational Exchange. Published by St. Martin's Press. New York, NY, 1992.

35. UNITWIN and the UNESCO Chairs Scheme - Listing of linkage programs for 1992-1993. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1992.

36. Letter from Phyllis Salem, Country Director - Lebanon, AMIDEAST. (Appendix 2-A)

37. Letter from Professor Oscar Soria, Executive Director, International University Council for Economic and Social Development (CUIDES). (Appendix 2-B)

38. Letter from Dr. Ninnat Olanvoravuth, Secretary General, The Association for South East Asian Institutions of Higher Learning (ASAIHL). (Appendix 2-C)

39. Letter from Sohair Saad, Associate Director, Educational Resource Center, AMIDEAST. (Appendix 2-E)

40. Letter from Dr. Fuad Sheikh Salam, Acting President, Yarmouk University, Jordan. (Appendix 2-F)

BIBLIOGRAPHY-4

41. Letter from Mark L. Sheldon, Director, The Chinese University of Hong Kong. (Appendix 2-G)

42. Letter from Virgilio De Los Santos, President, The University of Manila. (Appendix 2-H)

43. Letter from Dr. Ahnon Tiangtron, President, Maejo Institute of Agricultural Technology (MIAT), Thailand. (Appendix 2-I)

44. Letter from Dato Haji Abu Bakar Apong, Vice-Chancellor, Universiti Brunei Darussalam, Brunei. (Appendix 2-J)

45. Letter from Dr. Yawarat Porapakkham, Director, Asean Institute for Health Development (AIHD), Thailand. (Appendix 2-K)

46. Letter from Professor Tan Sri Dato' Dr. Nayan Ariffin, Vice-Chancellor, Universiti Pertanian Malaysia, Malaysia. (Appendix 2-L)

XIII. APPENDIX

APPENDIX-A

CONSULTATION
USAID Program to "Top Up" Salaries

ISSUE
The University Center of the US Agency for International Development and six major higher education associations are concerned with assisting universities in less developed countries to contribute to the development of their countries.

One proposal to help accomplish this task is to provide funds for up to 25% of a US faculty member's salary (not exceeding $20,000) to "top up" the person's salary so he or she can work in an institution in a less developed country during a sabbatical leave.

Included in the areas of interest are the less developed countries in Latin America, Africa, the Near East and Asia as well as the newly emerging democracies that were formerly a part of the USSR or the "East Bloc".

AGENDA
1. Introductions
2. Purpose of Consultation
3. Questions for Discussion

   A. How can an institution best aid development of its country?

   B. What disciplines, areas of research or public service are most needed?

   C. How important is "salary topping" in getting US professors to go to less developed countries?

   D. What methods of administration would make such a program most effective?

   E. What outcomes should be expected fro.n such a program that would make sense to donors concerned with the development of countries?

   F. What is the potential for professors from your institution going to LDC's? What institutional ties now exist?

   G. How can one optimize the long term effectiveness of faculty spending relatively short terms in institutions abroad?

   H. Could retired people be used, and if so how could they have a longer term relation to the project? What channels now exist for communication between retired faculty and your institution?

4. Usefulness of a "Opportunities Listing Database".

205 East 42nd Street, New York, NY 10017
Tel: 212-661-1414 Telex: 423227/6730395 Fax: 212-972-3231 Cable: Costudents

Appendix B

AID Feasibility Study
Group Consultation Meeting Attendees

Los Angeles, July 15 1992

Laverne University:
Alfred Clark

Loyola Marymount University:
Joanne Fisher
Eva Vidja

University of California, Los Angeles:
Russ Campell
John Hawkins
Edmond Keller
Leslie Koltai
Michael Lofchie
David Lopez
Hans Schollhammer
Dean Worth

University of California, Santa Barbara:
Jose Fulco

University of Southern California:
Michael H. Holloran

CIEE:
Henry D. Weaver
Stuart Richardson

Appendix B-2

US-AID Feasibility Study
Group Consultation Meeting Attendees

Washington, DC, July 21 1992

AID-Agency Center for University Cooperation in Development:
Jerome French
Lark Carter

Association Liaison Office:
Joan M. Claffey

Council for International Exchange of Scholars:
Cassandra Pyle

Eastern Mennonite College:
Lee Snyder

George Mason University:
Louis Guzman

The George Washington University:
Donald Driver
George Bozzini
Fernando Robles
Jennifer Wright

International Student Exchange Program:
Deborah Herrin

University of Maryland:
George Bean
Richard Weaver

World Bank:
Edward Heneveld

CIEE:
Henry D. Weaver
Stuart Richardson

Appendix B-3

US-AID Feasibility Study
Group Consultation Meeting Attendees

Durham, North Carolina, July 23 1992

Duke University:
Margaret Bates
Edna Andrews
Norman Christiensen

Duke University Medical School:
Dr. David Durack
Vance Staller (student)
Janet Routen (staff)

University of North Carolina:
Judith Tilson
Ann Dunbar

Campbell University:
Martin Sellars

North Carolina Central University:
Eugene Eaves

North Carolina State:
Gerald Elken

Guilford College:
Lee Johnson

CIEE:
Henry D.Weaver
Edith S. Katz
Stuart Richardson

Appendix C

AID Feasibility Study
Group Report/Flip-Chart Notes
U.C.L.A., July 15 1992

- Besides salary, there should be funds for housing.
- Existing lack of challenging assignments overseas.
- Universities must beginning by identifying fields of need.
- Use the money to develop local talent.
- Technical education is important, people should be brought to US for this also.
- The role of the universities "political process" must be developed.
- Current competition of US professors to positions in eastern europe.
- Need for contractual agreements between US and foreign schools.
- Should the grants be given to individuals?
- The money should be available for other expenses such as support staff, expenses, books, etc.

Institutional vs. Individual Grants

- Institutions have a "critical mass".
- Host must know exactly what they need.
- Short-term assignments must be part of a larger program.
- Housing should already be provided.

Conditions

- Tied to local priorities.
- Link
- Housing
- Make the money "expense money", not income.
- Build on top of pre-existing programs.
- May be better used as "supplemental" grants.

The amount is too small - should just be used in another way.

The possibility of using other AID facilities, such as housing, office equipment, communications, etc.

Use the 1.5 million as seed money, the program can always grow once it is successful. Focus the money.

Appendix C-2

- Flexibility (how to spend money)
- Focus
- Sustainibility
- Impact
- $ given to a consortium of US schools - emphasis on specialization.
- Fiscal accountability
- Support existing programs
- Meeting the need to getting the right person in the right place.
- Different models should be laid out.
- Use a variety of approaches
- There must be a US benefit from the exchange

Suggest to AID that the fund be set up with an "all-inclusive" approach

- The importance of the individual (i.e. P.I. on both sides (NSF))

Use Institutions

- To get more direction
- Easier to monitor
- Side benefits

Appendix D

AID Feasibility Study
Group Report/Flip-Chart Notes
George Washington University, July 21 1992

Review Page

- Focus on the agenda of the host country
- Topping up must be a part of "something larger" (on-going)
- Focus on internal discipline priorities
- Flexibility of the program

Areas of Study

- Technical areas less important
- Social Sciences to enhance democratic institution building
- Training of "leaders" (Administrational Education)
- Don't work with the N.G.O.'s, they're not surviving as it is

Objectives

1. To run efficient education programs.
2. To develop the entrepreneurial contract seeking functions (individual faculty as "exchange" do little to assist org.)
3. Faculty must not be going to further their own agenda
4. Needs to be part of a longer activity
5. Needs to have connections with western institutions to fully understand development
6. Knowing how the Institution relates to the society around it
7. Many faculty find a year too long. Possibility of shorter visits
8. Piggy-backing on sabbaticals - too limited an idea

- Most Latin American National Universities suffer from lack of funds and management. Consider the impact on smaller, private universities
- Concentrate on universities which are becoming "institutes of excellence"

Topping up both institutions?

1. Need to have a clear purpose in both directions
2. Funds to bring foreign nationals to US are equally important

Appendix D-2

Central Problem of Co-dependance.

1. Let "them" determine their own needs. "Needs database"
2. Locals form priorities from the countries leaders
3. Flexibility of program

- Working with other donor countries

Strengthening Institutions

1. Institutional planning
2. Agenda setting
3. Assisting other donors
4. Institutional marketing
5. Administrational effectiveness

- Total lack of professional university administrators in most of these countries
- Should focus on "things we can help you do to reach goals"
- Have we narrowed upon "development grant" too quickly? Could be a grant assisting in management & priority setting

Two-way Flow:

1. We must include the host countries in the planning
2. Up to both universities to make the proposal
3. Flexibility. Achieve a continuity of action between US institution and foreign institution in a variety of ways. Needs institutional support in order to be fully committed

- Room in the programs for small university participation
- Should the University Center administer the program? Universities could better support the field demands
- Individual faculty a KEY - there must be something in this for the individual
- The grant might be made to a department or to a university - but in any case must be university-supported
- Should be a joint award to US university and host university
- Not to be based on procurement of services but joint support for "mutually advancing activities"
- Might include people from institutions outside the US
- Could some or all of the IAF policies be used?
- AID must not be the middle man
- For a "joint award", both universities must "buy in"

Appendix D-3

Do foreign universities want US personnel?

- Yes
- Africa: Tremendous demand for administrational disciplines, organizational planning, management, counselling

Closing:

1. Don't tie program to sabbaticals
2. Short term assignment are more probable
3. International is now an important point of view in education
4. Topping-up is a bad term - use another
5. Remain flexible, remove constraints

Appendix E

AID Feasibility Study
Group Report/Flip-Chart Notes
Duke University, July 23 1992

Matching funds from institutions?

1. To start, no. Maybe later. Salaries = matching funds. Supplements may be necessary for travel. Problem of hard vs. local currencies.
2. Funds available from universities should not be limited to sabbaticals - use of research funds.

What do developing countries institutions need?

1. Libraries and library training. (esp. Africa)
2. Different priorities for different regions.
3. SE Asia - lack of experience, gaps in advanced courses.
4. Topping up needs differ by region.

Program must be flexible to each region/country.

1. Development specific.
2. Development general - environment etc.
3. Enrichment of university, generally.

* To what extent does this program conflict with current programs?

Compensating universities for loss of faculty member?

1. Schools differ in policies. Some have sabbatical compensation. Duke gives full pay for 1 semester. Other schools require you to repay the money if you wish to leave within three years of returning.

Enrichment of university generally.

1. Provided that the program is within the mission of the university.
2. Focused set of goal for the program.

All programs should have:

1. Conservation
2. Sustainibility
3. Environmental issues

Appendix E-2

Useful for "sending institutions" to be funded for replacements - can be used for fringe expenses, etc. ($7,500 - $10,000)

Incentives:

1. To faculty.
2. To university to overcome administrational obstacles.

Reciprocity

1. Essential to have faculty from developing countries come to US.
2. Cost-effectiveness of inbound faculty? Varies depending on country.
3. Logistically simpler if done one way.

To whom should grants be given?

1. Grants to faculty members. Advantage of this depends on particular situation with sending institution.
2. Individual should have responsibility for arrangement.
3. Should minimize the administrational component. (principle of host university involvement OK, but may delay program.

Application

1. Should be short, maximum of 3 pages.
2. Should have a quick review time - within 6 months if possible, with a window of time to pick it up.
3. Faculty needs to know about 1 year in advance.

Administration of program NOT through AID - too long a turn-around. Which agency?

Retiree Market

1. How are retirees tied to sending institutions? Need for sustainibility.
2. There is an argument for limiting the program to active faculty, more effect on campus from returning faculty.
3. Disadvantage for non-tenured faculty being off-campus.
4. Non-discriminating policy that requires demonstrated connections with US and host institutions.

Appendix E-3

What disciplines are most important?

1. Library Science/Info transfer
2. Health/ Public Health
3. Politics/Public Policy
4. Environment

Disciplines needed by host institution and region to be decided by peer review

1. Humanities?
2. Law and Society
3. English teachers

Decisions of discipline to be based on expressed needs of host university.

We should not impose.

No discipline should be excluded.

Is this program competitive with USIA? A drain on available funds?

Small topping-off funds for many people, or substantial funding for a few?

Put on a high "upper limit", state what the average grant has been and ask individual to develop a proposal which is flexible.

Board of Science and Technical International Development - part of national academy of sciences, uses retirees and provide expenses

Faculty members should be put into the database - another way of advertising

Look into R.S.V.P. - Retired Senior Volunteer Program

Appendix F

USAID Feasibility Study
Discussion Summary from Focus Group #1
UCLA
July 15, 1992

Participants:
Hans Schollhammer - UCLA
Russel Campbell - UCLA
Jose Fulco - UCSB
Mike Holloran - USC
Eva Vidja - Loyola Marymount
Joanne Fisher - Loyola Marymount
Edmond Keller - UCLA
Dean Worth - UCLA
Leslie Koltai - UCLA
Mike Lofchie - UCLA
Alfred Clark - Laverne University
David Lopez - UCLA

Staff:
Henry D. Weaver
Stuart Richardson

What are the incentives to getting faculty into positions in developing countries?

ML: Not money, but expenses and housing.

HS: A challenging work and research environment.

AC: Universities are seen as a threat to many developing countries. Hosts and universities need to figure out how to cooperate effectively. A university can lead the country - use that as the incentive.

EK: Emphasize the needs of the individual country. Train local talent to exploit industry.

JF: It isn't currently possible to do technical education in many developing countries. Individuals may not return because it's too frustrating. Planning is very important.

ML: Focus on the smaller units within the institutions and the individuals. Zero in on the individuals who are connected. You can't deal with an entire institution. In many of these countries professors are also consultants.

DW: In east Europe the Academy of Sciences plays a more important role. The academicians are more connected to the government, more likely to accomplish something.

EK: We should aid the whole university. Many universities in developing countries are just opening. Develop these new universities to serve specific local needs.

JF: Sometimes what you want to give and what they want to receive are so different. We are so far ahead in so many issues - Women's Studies. The Jesuits have attempted to create a link between US and Asian universities. I support the idea of focusing on smaller groups within the schools, they're more accessible.

DL: So many different types/levels of schools. Some still separate boys from girls, some still don't take Jewish students.

JF: Financially - many profs. are married - income issues.

LK: European universities are competing to get professors into their schools, many are now providing housing, cars, and cooks.

HW: Should grants be given to individuals or institutions?

DL: Definitely to individuals.

LK: US profs. should be paid more - European schools provide amazing perks for their teachers. The grant should also factor in all the local support that is needed.

HS: Institutional models of linkages work better than individuals. You need to have a critical mass. Giving money to individuals is too loose, unstructured.

RC: Short term visits are ineffective unless the host country knows specifically what it wants. If they don't, the individual just ends up doing what they wish to do. Linkages must have continuity.

JF: Establish a 5 year grant, have return visits, exchange materials, develop a sustainable relationship.

DW: $1.5 million won't buy a 5 year grant.

EK: US should make the host pay housing.

AC: Is aiding the institution at cross purposes with what the professor wants to do? I favor topping up if it serves local needs.

DL: The housing issue is very real. Money should be thought of as expense money - not taxable. Connect this program to others.

MH: All countries are so different. The money will be used differently in each country. Make the grant proposals as specific as possible.

HS: Go to AID and tell them this isn't enough money for this program. Too piddling to make a difference.

GENERAL CONSENSUS

HS: So much Fulbright money has been wasted, there is no follow up.

HW: In Katmandu, money was provided for eight years for chemistry.

ML: AID is very complex. Often AID has offices etc. in these countries. We should have access to AID housing, faxes, phones, transportation etc. The missions can provide lots of help.

LK: We should take the money, build a small, successful program that can get larger later.

HS: Money should be focused.

JF: If the question is - is this program useful, I would say no. But if your going to do it, I will make suggestions.

HS: Focus on consortiums, they are stronger.

LK: Sustainability - there must be a commitment to time. IMPACT on a certain area - agriculture, economy, etc.

JF: Funds should be given only on the basis of a planned proposal.

MH: Isn't this money to existing linkages, ones that are struggling?

HS: If it's struggling, it hasn't been effective.

RC: I don't like too many pre-conditions (like a financial ceiling) You have to give people what they need to get the right man for the job.

DL: I agree, it must be flexible.

LK: This offer is a good first step. Money gets re-routed to other things all the time so we

LK: (cont.) mustn't reject it. Just say that there are a variety of approaches we can take.

CONSENSUS

LK: Put more money into institutional relationships and support services.

AC: The focus should come from the host, not what we think they need.

ML: Exchange is mutually enriching. If the host is aided in development that's a second benefit. Topping up can be effective in getting the right man to the right place.

DW: The money needs to be flexible. Some people won't need as much. Some may want extra for research assistants.

LK: Consortiums are a good idea.

HS: Institutions provide built-in quality control. Stipulate that conditions be adhered to.

JF: There is a precedent for this form of cooperation.

AC: Consortiums should be broad based - let the smaller schools in.

HS: Consortiums help in the competitive bidding process.

DW: Large schools have more resources, more organized structure.

HW: How would the commitment be met from the other side?

JF: Institutions in less developed countries have many problems. The individual there is KEY. But the institutions should check to make sure that the work is for the right purposes. Institutions in the developing world are completely unreliable. There is no accountability or sustainability.

HS: It's easier for USAID to monitor an institution than an individual.

Notes by Stuart Richardson

Appendix G

USAID Feasibility Study
Discussion Summary from Focus Group Meeting #2
George Washington University
July 21, 1992

Participants:
Lark Carter - Agency Center
Ferdinand Robles - GWU
Ward Heneveld - World Bank
Joan Claffey - Association Liaison Office
Cassie Pyle - CIES
Jerry French - World Bank
Don Driver - GWU
Lee Snyder - Eastern Mennonite College
Jennifer Wright - GWU
Deborah Herrin - ISEP
Richard Weaver - U. of Maryland
Louis Guzman - George Mason U.

Staff:
Henry D. Weaver
Stuart Richardson

JC: The main thrust of HEAD is to strengthen education in developing countries mainly as it relates to development (local). The second benefit is the enrichment of US institutions.

Several mechanisms are being considered:
1. Networks
2. Management training (i.e. health care)
3. Annual competitions
4. Faculty exchange with the possibility of a topping up fund
5. Continuing education for Alumni from developing countries

AID has finished with it's massive "bricks and mortar" work. The money no longer exists. The organization is now looking to piggy-back/assist/enhance existing programs. The Association Liaison Office is drawing on campus expertise to see what the thinking on this is.

JF: We want to develop the activities we have had in agriculture in other areas. AID is very short on money. Nobody at the organization feels that it is appropriate to "develop" in the same ways now. Internationalization of US universities is important. The underlying assumption is that universities in the developing world are a critical part of that countries development. We want to strategically develop their role.

LC: The HEAD project will involve more networking than the linkage projects. HEAD is projected at $17 million.

JF: Head will be broader in terms of where the money goes. At the same time it will be focused on strengthening the organizations within developing countries.

HW: Reactions?

LG: Technical and agricultural studies are less important today. Social Sciences and related practices that enhance democratic institution building should take priority. NGO kind of work - assisting local communities, training people how to assess needs, develop solutions.

CP: But do these people look to education?

LG: The NGO movement cannot survive alone. They provide educational back-up, help to small companies.

WH: The education needs to be efficient. Currently, some students remain undergrad. for 15 years. Entrepreneurial contract development is important - this could really move the university into the development process.

Individual faculty members always travel with their own agenda, this must be more than a twelve month program.

CP: I disagree. They need to connect with western institutions to see how we function, develop, expand, fundraise, solve problems. They have no understanding of how we function. The question is what role does faculty play? What voice do they have?

The relationships need to be sustained. We see enormous wastage in Fulbright. Many of these countries are deteriorating.

I wouldn't send one man out as the front man. They wouldn't accomplish anything.

WH: The program must work within the local agenda.

RW: "Sabbatical" is limiting our conversation. Sabbatical is about research, publication, promotion and tenure.

FR: In Latin America most institutions are national - they lack investment, development, faculty - where do you make a real impact in a situation like that? It's easier to do in a smaller school. There are some schools that are slowly becoming centers of excellence. My advice would be to work with those institutions.

Appendix G-3

Identify the schools that you want to help.

JF: Explore the idea of a two way flow.

WH: The program must fulfill their needs - not ours. The program must be between equals.

LG: Locate need, expression, priority direction. It's for us to be responsive. Long term contracts are better, they create strength.

CP: Cooperation with other major donors - in Europe for example. Too much money is wasted in duplicating other programs. We must get beyond individual country investment.

JC: We need to get:
1. Institutional planning
2. Agenda setting
3. "Assistant donors"
4. Administrational effectiveness

Did we narrow our focus too quickly on topping up and sabbatical?

WH: Maybe a team should be sent in to develop focus.

RW: Have we narrowed down the idea of development too quickly? What about the environment, the economy, free-market economies?

WH: Add the two together - development of administrational efficiency PLUS environment, economy, etc.

1. The importance of a focus that is developed by the hosting country.
2. Topping up must be part of a larger scheme.
3. Strategic/Institutional planning
4. Focusing on internal priorities.

RW: I would like to see a proposal that solicits proposals from US institutions, keeping the mechanism open. Different schools have different ideas.

LG: Flexible. But continuity is important. A responsive system that relates to many universities.

Long term objective + commitment = basis for relationship.

FR: Commitment from both sides.

RW: How is this different from the linkage program?

Appendix G-4

This program should come more specifically out of 1 department, maybe collaborating with people in other schools.

LS: I second this idea, it's flexible and continuous.

RW: For linkage to be effective, universities need to build multi-field based relationships.

LG: The universities should make up the service system, responding to the needs to the field.

DH: Its possible that the groups would have a regional focus.

RW: Let's get away from the administrational stuff. It's more important to tie-in to pre-existing programs and relationships.

LS: The faculty must have a vested interest in a particular area.

LG: Information exchange - people working together towards a stated goal.

RW: So topping up could be used in a variety of ways.

LS: Use money for staffing considerations also.

RW: Is grant given to individual or university? You need the support of the university.

FR: The money should be given to both schools.

GB: Universities take too much money out for overhead. You can get institutional support without giving them the money.

CP: With Fulbright, Universities don't take responsibility because the money isn't theirs. There is also the issue of recognition and reward which is usually overlooked.

Combine the best university support with the vitality and energy of the individuals.

JC: This program will be based on AID b[illegible] into a collaboration based on the self-interest of both the individual and the institution.

JF: The need must be identified primarily by the host country. Then a US institution responds to that.

There should be a commitment whether AID is involved or not - this makes sustainibility more likely.

Appendix G-5

LG: The International American Foundation in DC sends representatives back and forth between countries. However, after sending the money to recipients they completely back-off. They place the responsibility in the hands of the individuals. The result is that their operating overhead is between 7% and 9%. Maybe the administration could be handled by the host university.

JW: The host country needs to be involved in the proposal.

HW: What about supply/demand? Is there faculty available?

JW: Developing countries always want US personnel. US professors usually aren't interested. In that respect, topping up could be very important.

DD: How does the program ensure that the institutions are being referred to the correct individuals?

GB: The program must not be tied to sabbatical leave. Very few people can leave for six months. There must be an incentive.

LS: We have many teachers who leave the country for their sabbaticals.

DH: What about the "greying" of faculty, will there be enough?

LS: How do you develop interest in younger faculty?

LG: Sabbatical is inappropriate here.

GB: It's antithetical to the concept of service.

ALL AGREE THAT THE PROGRAM SHOULD BE OPEN TO TERMS OF LESS THAN ONE YEAR.

CP: We mustn't forget the time period that we are currently in. We've got real problems in this country right now. There are enormous racial tensions, people are afraid of loosing their jobs. And at the same time this whole new "international" concept is exploding. We must be very sensitive to the pressures that face faculty and our institutions. Flexibility is the key word.

GB: Remove as many constraints as possible.

Notes by Stuart Richardson

Appendix H

USAID Feasibility Study
Discussion Summary from Focus Group Meeting #3
Duke University Medical Center
July 23, 1992

Participants:
Anne Dunbar - University of North Carolina
Judith Tilson - University of North Carolina
Martin Sellars - Campbell University
Deborah Weaver - Campbell University
Norman Christiensen - Duke University
Janet Routen - Duke University
David Durack - Duke University Medical School
Vance Staller -Duke University Medical School
Lee Johnson - Guilford College
Edna Andrews - Duke University
Gerald Elken - North Carolina State University
Margaret Bates - Duke University

Staff:
Henry D. Weaver
Edith S. Katz
Stuart Richardson

MB: The program should cover travel expenses, and a discretionary fund.

LJ: At Guilford, sabbaticals are fiercely guarded for writing. The program shouldn't be limited to sabbaticals.

DD: Sabbaticals are unnecessarily restrictive.

HW: What do institutions abroad need?

AD: In Africa the strongest needs are for libraries and training. And the ability to have research leaves. Some libraries haven't purchased a book for 15 years.

DD: Ghana is the same.

DD: Topping up must be flexible because salaries are all so different.

NC: The proposal should include how the needs of the host country will be met. Specificity must be key.

DD: Should it be that specific? It could be broader with the understanding that enriching the host university is enough.

NC: That conflicts with existing programs.

Appendix H-2

GE: Should go beyond Sabbatical.

The problem with the IPA program is that there is no money to help the donor university.

Replacement money might be more important than topping off.

DD: 3 choices for an approach:
1. Development specific.
2. Development general.
3. Enriching the university is enough.

NC: Obviously we would all favor #3 because it's the most flexible but that would conflict with other programs.

MB: Programs are better when they are specific. Less risk of diffusion.

NC: Having focused goal will make evaluation of the program easier.

DD: Development is a broad area - Conservation, sustainibility, environment, etc.

EA: Host university must be part of planning.

GE: Replacement money. Universities need that if they loose someone for 1 year.

MS: At Campbell the pace is hectic. We carry 5 courses each. After sabbatical you are required to teach for 3 to 6 years straight, so people take it very seriously.

LJ: At Guilford people are more enthusiastic about sabbaticals. But replacement money is needed. We receive full pay for 6 months, or half pay for 1 year.

AD: At of UNC we have no sabbatical policy. It's very complicated.

DD: Program should offer $7,500 - $10,000 to donor university, which they could use in a variety of different ways. This would provide another incentive.

JT: Two-way flow is essential.

GE: One problem is that when people come to the US, they learn so much that upon return they are promoted out of the "realm of influence."

MB: 2-way flow is more beneficial. There is more sustainibility.

EA: The money should be given to the individual. It makes them take responsibility.

NC: Again, this is idiosyncratic. At Duke, it is better through the school. It all goes back to incentives.

Appendix H-3

VS: Money being channeled through the schools can slow things up.

GE: Being paid directly by Fulbright was great. It tied me in with the local university, they took more of an interest in me.

DD: Joint applications are a recipe for disaster. Only a small amount of info. should be required from the host, listing classes, hours, responsibilities, etc.

EA: The documents should be standardized for each area of the world.

DD: A short funding cycle - 6 months.

GE: You need to go about a year before you go in order to make all the proper arrangements.

LJ: For smaller schools, lead time is very important.

GE: AID money can be committed up front. Therefore it should be administered by someone else.

HW: What about tapping the retired community?

GE: It would make the institutional relationship harder to sustain.

NC: Depends on the long term objective. Younger people would focus the relationship more.

MS: Better for a full-time employee to return to the institution with their experiences.

GE: Young people in science loose their edge by being away for 2 years. People in the humanities can learn and grow. Older people can do it with less loss.

EA: The policy should be non-discriminatory. Ask the applicant to demonstrate a relationship with the host institution and a desire to help the development of the country.

HW: What disciplines would be helpful?

DD: Information systems, library science, public health.

MS: Free market thinking, politics.

GE: All disciplines depending on the needs of the host.

Exclude no area but involve local determination.

Appendix H-4

GE: Ultimately the contact/relationship that is formed is more beneficial than the work performed by the individual.

NC: It's good for a program to have a strong identity. It can then defend it's individual worth.

DD: Maybe it's better to send less people with more funds.

The money should be flexible. Put on a high limit and suggest the average budget.

MB: Don't tie the hands too soon. People can apply to the program and then think about the money afterwards.

GE: Put in a clause that says "Maximum amount of money available for release of staff".

Don't mention overhead, everyone will steal.

DD: The biggest question is that of 2-way flow.

In many ways, it's simpler to just say: We're sending only.

MB: The 2-way can always develop later.

Notes by Stuart Richardson

Appendix I

US-AID Feasibility Study
Summary of several conversations on RISE Program with Sandra Cervera, IIE
Notes by Edith S. Katz

RISE was conceived of as a "dating service", placing U.S. faculty in institutions in the developing world. It was staffed by one professional (and a secretary) who created the computer program for the clearinghouse, did outreach to schools and faculty and answered inquiries. The program was originally launched by a start-up grant from the Mellon Foundation and it existed from 1981 to 1986.

The original plan was to provide a free service to the Third World host institutions while charging the U.S. volunteers a small fee. They started by charging $35 for registration with unlimited referrals. Later they increased the fee to $50 and still could not cover the costs. Initially, the host universities paid nothing but later were asked to pay a small fee rising to $500 maximum for ten or more position-listings. A basic cause for the demise of the program was that universities would not pay for what was formerly offered free. Another significant problem was that the applicants wanted short-term assignments but the hosts, required to pay transportation, obviously preferred long-timers.

While it lasted, it worked very well and they made many placements. Cervera feels that a registry of 500 persons could be handled by one professional. RISE eventually had about 3,000 registrants and it became impossible to handle by herself.

Placements were made by letter, telephone and through visits to New York by representatives of the host universities. The responsibility for the interview was borne by the host institution in any way (including telephone interviews) they chose.

Health

Cervera noted that this program operated in the years pre-AIDS and that today the problems are far greater, especially in Africa. In their experience, no-one became seriously ill, but with a retired population, chronic illness requiring medication, attention must be paid to insurance and health disclaimers.

Language

Language was not a problem. Spanish and English were the most common and there were volunteers to meet the needs of the hosts.

Appendix 1-2

Overhead

Cervera mentioned that the overhead costs substantially exceeded their expectations. Postage and telephone costs were enormous as was the cost of advertisements in the Chronicle and elsewhere announcing the program. There was a large volume of telephone inquiries that completely overwhelmed the staff.

Staffing is needed to sell the service, enter the data into the computer, talk on the phone to recruits and to develop informational and marketing materials. Some other suggestions were:

- Do not get involved in contractual situation.
- Reduce paperwork and need for calls
- Advise U.S. embassy or consulate in host country about volunteer.

Appendix J

US-AID Feasibility Study
Notes on meeting at Peace Corps
Notes by Edith S. Katz

Present: Edith Katz, CIEE
Pam Prochnow, Director, Private Sector Relations (tel: 202 606-3360)
Kim Rowe, Manager, Volunteer Partner Program (tel: 202 606-3112)

See attached descriptive flyer and copy of ad in NY Times.

This is a new program of the Peace Corps, the first time they are sending short-term (six months to one year) volunteer experts.

The following is the process through which volunteers go before being placed.

- Interview by members of Peace Corps professional staff, locally by regional office
- Provision of six letters of recommendation
- Nomination by local office
- Visit to Washington, seen by Evaluation Unit, Peace Corps
- Provision of medical information by recruit
- Medical exam if indicated
- Legal search to discover legal obligations that might serve as obstacle (i.e. taxes owed, divorce agreement)
- Health insurance eligibility review (to rule out previous exposure to hepatitis or malaria, et alia)

Process takes about nine months. Staff is convinced that all elements are necessary to prevent failures of placement.

Placement is preceded by 12 weeks pre-service training including language and cultural sensitivity.

To date, they have completed 50 applications and are trying to shorten the process. The host county does not have a choice of volunteer. Rather, they are arranged by Peace Corps. Host pays living costs in-country.

Appendix K

US-AID Feasibility Study
Telephone conversations with Bette Worley, President, National Faculty Exchange
Notes by Edith S. Katz

3 Programs: National Faculty Exchange (NFE)
Emeriti Placement Program (EPP)
Clearinghouse for International Faculty & Staff Exchange (CIFSE)

NFE

Started nine years ago to place and exchange active and employed faculty in member institutions. This is a "mating service", with heavy staff input. They control, broker and negotiate contracts between faculty and institutions. Member institutions pay an annual fee of $600 for unlimited service. NFE has a contact on each member campus, a faculty development person or someone with cross-discipline responsibility.

There are 110 member institutions (plus federal agencies and educational associations, such as ACE, who pay no fee). They serve about 190 applicant per year. Applicants pay no fee. Member's fees barely cover costs.

This program features a "body in - body out" exchange (not necessarily a one-to-one direct exchange of professors in the same discipline taking one another's place and possibly exchanging domiciles). The exchange can be cross-disciplinary. Each person carries his own salary and fringe benefits with him. In a few cases, institutions allow a faculty member to go to another school without receiving an exchange. In these cases, the experience is viewed as a faculty development opportunity.

EPP

Started more recently as a "dating service" clearinghouse. Twice a year they produce a listing of retired faculty by discipline and distribute to their membership. EPP uses NFE contacts on each campus to create listings. They maintain a file of resumés which they make available to the hiring schools. They also provide limited help on contractual arrangements but essentially this program is designed just to inform the suppliers and demanders of one anothers' needs.

Registrants pay a fee of $25 for that. Their names remain in the data base for two years and they are informed of university openings in their field. No guarantees.

Bette Worley made a special point of noting that retirees take a lot of staff time. Far more than the actively employed clients. They expect to communicate more frequently. They call a lot and demand a lot. They have more free time to do it.

There is no exchange component in this program.

CIFSE

One year ago, Mary Ann Grant of ISEP approached Betty Worley and suggested that the two organizations cooperate on establishing a clearinghouse service for currently employed faculty and administrators who want to work outside the U.S. and to exchange with non-U.S. faculty. The idea was to combine the U.S. membership of the NFE with the overseas institutional contacts of ISEP.

This is a "dating service" with a $25 registration fee. The registry lists individuals and institutions by discipline and country. CIFSE provides sample contracts and materials advising on exchanging domiciles. This is a direct, one-for-one exchange with each individual carrying his own salary and fringe benefits.

For institutions outside of the NFE and ISEP membership, there is a $100 fee.

This program has had initial funding from FIPSE and the Pew Foundation sufficient for one year's operation. The two organizations are not prepared to go further without further funding and they now have a grant application in to FIPSE. If it works, they will begin to include retirees.

The NFE/ISEP program does not focus on Third World countries. Just the reverse; their plan of one-for-one exchanges is only viable in developed countries. However, we might consider the possibilities of a joint venture.

Note:

Bette Worley is also the Executive Director of the National Student Exchange, the national counterpart of ISEP.

NFE has an outreach program involving the HBCU's.

Appendix L

US-AID Feasibility Study
Notes/International Research & Exchanges Board (IREX)
June 30, 1992

Present:
Henry Weaver - CIEE
Stuart Richardson - CIEE
Vivian Abbott - Associate Director, IREX
Beata Dafeldecker - Senior Program Officer, East European Programs, IREX

SOCIAL/ACADEMIC CLIMATE IN EASTERN EUROPE

The meeting began with a brief discussion on the use of the word "developing" when describing eastern European countries, which Dr. Abbott said eastern Europeans do not like. They see themselves as having a great deal of industrial, cultural, scientific, and educational history, and are therefore not "developing" in the usual sense of the word. They prefer to be thought of as "newly emerging democracies." Also they do not like to be referred to as "former".

Dr. Dafeldecker noted that there is much greater receptivity to American scholars in the southern tier countries (Bulgaria, Albania, Rumania). The northern tier has already been saturated with American programs.

The general environment is more trusting now. Gone are the days when american academics were suspected of being CIA. The eastern Europeans are enjoying a "love affair" with America, with Albanians being the most ardent. Dr. Abbott referred to eastern Europe as "the last frontier in America-love."

In the academic world, the academies are struggling to stay in tact. Most people perceive them as being Stalinist, having been so heavily subsidized. Dr. Abbott said that in each country the response of the academies is different - the Polish ones are shopping for new things to do, the Rumanian ones are simply surviving, and the Hungarians are currently taking a vote.

Dr. Dafeldecker noted that there is a long tradition of competition between the academies and the universities because those who work at the academies aren't required to teach.

"TOPPING OFF"

Dr. Abbott's immediate response to the idea of "topping off" salaries for eastern European sabbaticals was that, financially speaking, it might be unnecessary - since the cost of living there is so much lower. The usual percentage of the salary received by American professors on sabbatical would be more than sufficient to live comfortably in those countries.

Appendix L-2

NOTE: The average Czech professor makes $150 per month and gets by on that quite well, partly because of low cost housing for residents.

HOUSING

Both Dr. Abbott and Dr. Dafeldecker agreed that housing represents a challenge.

Dr. Dafeldecker noted that most eastern Europeans are aware that their local housing is inadequate for visiting Americans.

Most universities have guest houses, but these are only available for short term stays. The going rate for an apartment in Prague is about $600 per month.

According to Dr. Dafeldecker, most American professors usually end up finding their own housing, though one is more successful when using local assistance.

NOTE: In keeping with the current entrepreneurial spirit in eastern Europe, bed and breakfast accommodations have become very popular.

ACADEMIC NEEDS

Both strongly agreed that in this part of Europe the greatest academic needs are in the areas of Social Sciences, Business, Economics, and Management. The hard sciences have traditionally received adequate attention, but eastern Europeans now want to learn the skills that will help them to run businesses like Americans.

Dr. Dafeldecker noted that there is intense interest in Political Science. Also that particular subjects have never been studied at all - such as Sociology - which did not exist in Albania until about two months ago.

ENGLISH CAPABILITIES

Dr. Abbott described the average english ability of people in the universities as "capable". Most of the IREX scholars already possess language skills, except scientists who generally use english as a common language.

Although less exposed to American programs, the peoples of the southern tier speak english as proficiently as those in the Northern tier. IREX recently did a survey in Rumania and were surprised by the level of english there.

NOTE: Lehigh University will soon begin broadcasting classes to Easter Europe via Satellite in English.

Dr. Abbott said that she had received many inquiries from teachers who would love to teach in Eastern Europe but that IREX is unable to help them.

She also noted that the percentage of the American population that is retired is growing rapidly, that we will see increasing numbers of healthy, robust, educated retirees looking for work in the areas of volunteerism, etc.

WHAT ARE THE LIMITATIONS IN THIS AREA OF EXCHANGE?

According to Dr. Dafeldecker there is no existing organizational structure to facilitate this. The Citizens Democratic Core has been sending technical people, but not teachers. Dr. Abbott said that she usually refers teachers to Walter Raymond at U.S.I.A. (United States Information Agency), or Carol Adelman at A.I.D.(Agency for International Development).

Dr. Abbott noted that the Sabre Foundation, which solicits donations of books from publishing companies, has been very successful in getting text books over to Europe.

Also, there is an individual in New York, called George Mindon who runs a very simple ad hoc operation that gives money to organizations sending text books to Europe.

OTHER NEEDS?

At a colloquium of the American Library Association held last year, it was learned that eastern Europe needs intense help in the area of libraries and information personnel. NOTE: Mariana

Cholden/University of Ill. is an expert on the needs of eastern Europe in this particular area.

Also, since the re-structuring there has been an enormous cutback in administrative personnel. Many people at the schools and universities are feeling very overworked.

Universities are having trouble keeping good people in jobs. Many workers that were communists are now persona non-grata. Therefore competant people are in demand. This is connected to employers putting non-communists in positions for which they are not qualified simply based on their political orientations.

Appendix M

US-AID Feasibility Study
Notes/Agency for International Development
July 20, 1992

Robert Nachtrieb - AID
Henry Weaver - CIEE
Stuart Richardson - CIEE

The meeting began with a discussion of the term "topping-up". Mr. Nachtrieb warned against using this term as it is often confused with the topping-up of nationals salaries. Mr. Nachtrieb recommended administering grants to institutions rather than individuals. Since it is possible that one grant made to one school could be divided between many different people, he believes that this could greatly reduce administrational work. Also this avoids AID having to choose one professor over another, the school is left to make that decision along with the host university. This structure is already working in the Management Training in Economic Education program in Eastern Europe.

Most of the money allocated through the S.E.E.D. Act is targeted toward encouraging studies that are "pro-democracy" and "pro-open market." The program has a very narrow focus - management training and economics. Mr. Nachtrieb noted that it is possible that Stuart Callison may direct the money towards other disciplines from the University Center.

AID has so far awarded grants through public competition. Grants were made to institutions with a pre-existing link to foreign institution. Mr. Nachtrieb wasn't sure if the list of applicants is public knowledge, Stu Callison would have more information on this, he said.

Among other academic needs, Mr. Nachtrieb noted history as having great importance. Also any discipline that would encourage and nurture "personal responsibility". Eastern Europe is filled with two generations of citizens who do not understand how one takes personal responsibility for one's own life, in terms of personal finance, housing, and voting, etc. According to Mr. Nachtrieb citizens of Eastern Europe simply need to be around American professors, to understand how Americans look to individual initiative and individual risk-assumption. "Any field will be useful because of the approach we follow."

Mr. Nachtrieb said that getting the use of an AID office would be highly unlikely, and not really necessary. All that is needed for adequate communication is a fax machine and these are now readily available.

AID has a new "Participant Training Program" which will bring people to the US from Eastern Europe for both work and study.

Mr. Nachtrieb believes that this program is worth pursuing if the grants are made to institutions.

Appendix N

US-AID Feasibility Study
Notes/Council for International Exchange of Scholars
July 21, 1992

Cassandra Pyle - CIES
Henry Weaver - CIEE
Stuart Richardson - CIEE

Geographically, Ms. Pyle said that scholars are more than willing to work in Eastern Europe, particularly Hungary and Czechoslovakia. Africa has become extremely problematic for both health (AIDS/Malaria) and political reasons.

CIES experimented with holding program orientations in the US before sending scholars overseas but these became too costly. Also, the time was increasingly taken up by US government issues, rather than orientating the scholars towards the environment and culture they were about to enter.

Henry asked for recommendations regarding selection procedures. Ms. Pyle recommends that the system be as simple as possible, yet providing certain safeguards. In CIES nominations are initially screened by discipline, and then by geographic area. The most complicated part of the process remains "peer review" - which must be done with great sensitivity. Ms. Pyle noted that scholars can be quite "prickly" about who is reviewing them.

The current linkages being administered by USIA are much broader based than those proposed by this study, Ms. Pyle said. She also feels that USIA has paid too little attention to the ratings(?)

Most importantly this program must be "needs driven" - the initiative, or first step, must come from the host country.

Ms. Pyle said that more than anything else, institutions of higher learning in developing countries need mechanisms for broad based institutional change. This goal should be key to the program, rather than funding elements of exchange that the linkage program should be covering.

The program must be prepared to treat the host institutions as full partners, included from the first.

Ms. Pyle wonders if at some point a narrowing of geographic focus might be in order. The program must also contain a mechanism for a close out report.
Henry asked to what extent Ms. Pyle can visualize an AID post buying into the program. Ms. Pyle believes that the post can be essential in delivering assistance (communication and medical) but ultimately the support of the university is more dependable.

Appendix O

US-AID Feasibility Study
Notes/United States Information Agency
July 22, 1992

Leonard Haynes - USIA
Henry Weaver - CIEE
Stuart Richardson - CIEE

Barry Ballow is responsible for the linkage programs at USIA. He is about to launch a comprehensive evaluation of the program. He may have some preliminary data available. In the past the ministries have kept better lists than USIA.

For recommendations regarding top-off grants, Dr. Haynes suggested contacting Adi O'Connel, the Director of Academic Exchanges.

Dr. Haynes pointed out that long-standing commitment from US institutions is hard to achieve when leadership turnover is so high. In order for a program to be long-lasting it must have the backing of a firmly rooted president. This situation also makes it difficult to ascertain how committed schools are to international exchange.

Regarding the possible inclusion of AID posts in the administration of the program, Dr. Haynes believes willingness would vary from country to country. Members of the Foreign Service all have very different perspectives and agendas, also they rotate positions frequently.

India and Egypt all have organizations of institutes of higher learning. Mexico has an organization called Fenpez(?) All dealings with Africa are done through Fulbright. Working with African institutions is frustrating because African institutions open and close frequently.

Regarding UVA, Dr. Haynes believes that a database would be useful if it listed people as well as positions. Apparently, the National Endowment has already done this.

In terms of academic needs, Dr. Haynes said that American Studies would be very important. He recommended speaking with Judy Segal, the Director of US Studies in the Department of Education.

NOTE: Dr. Haynes recommended speaking to Dr. Emoungu, who works on Adi O'Connels staff at USIA.

Appendix P

US-AID Feasibility Study
Notes/Board on Science and Technology for International Development (B.O.S.T.I.D.)
July 30, 1992

Neil Brandis - B.O.S.T.I.D.
Stuart Richardson - C.I.E.E.

BOSTID is the arm of the Offices of International Affairs of the National Research Council that serves the National Academy of Sciences. The program is funded by government contracts and private foundation grants to produce reports, publications and evaluations. In order to perform these tasks in a non-partisan fashion, BOSTID draws upon the services of volunteers to do the necessary research and recommendations. Volunteers will sometimes be sent overseas to do research, usually for short periods of time, rarely longer than one month. At this time, for example, the program has been commissioned to do a study on information systems in Africa. Volunteers have been sent there to perform the necessary research. Bostid covers the costs of expenses and transportation.

Most relevant to our current research is that BOSTID has been commissioned to convene the review panels for the USAID university linkage program for both years of it's existence.

The review process is as follows:

Level 1: Applications are sent out to over 200 "readers" who are experienced experts in the geographic area who also have a strong academic background. They study the proposals and attach evaluations.

Level 2: All applications are then sent, with Level 1 evaluations attached, to a panel of 16 experts with experience in the related discipline.

Level 3: Simultaneously, comments are solicited from the missions in the concerned country.

The entire review process takes up to 2.5 months. The final decisions are made when the "Expert Panel" (the same one used in Level 2) actually comes together for a 3 day conference. Note that the number of applications is not pared down as they pass through the various levels, each application is seen by all three groups.

In terms of notification, recipients usually receive 5 to 6 months notice before the proposed start date of the project. Neil conceded that this is usually not enough time.

Even though development is not specified in proposal materials, Neil said that the panels have a clear preference for proposals that demonstrate a clear link to local development.

Appendix P-2

Linkages that have been funded in the past two years represent a balanced cross-section of pre-existing and new. About 50% of recipients are teams which had worked together before but had lost the means to continue working together. The majority are multi-department/inter-disciplinary relationships.

Mr. Brandis said that one of the most critical judgement areas is the following question: Will this work continue after the seed money dries up? For many panelists this is a core issue. The question is usually answered by evaluating the applicants possibilities for finding other sources of funding.

Michael Dow is the Acting Director of BOSTID. His telephone number is 202-334-3049.

Appendix Q

US-AID Feasibility Study
Notes/UNESCO
July 30, 1992

Colin Power - Director of Education, UNESCO (45.68.10.00)
Stuart Richardson - CIEE

UNESCO has recently started a program called "UNITWIN". The project is one year old and has offices in each of the global regions. The main focus of the program is the development of university linkages. Since UNICEF headquarters is in Paris, the majority of linkages exist between schools in Europe and the less-developed world. However, some schools in Canada, Australia and the US are currently participating.

The initiation for the linkage can come from either school. UNITWIN provides a token amount of start-up funding and then seeks additional funds from private sources. Time periods for exchanges are very flexible, ranging from two months to two years. Most participants are supported by their institutions while working in the "twin" institution, they are not necessarily on sabbatical. NOTE: The program also includes many retired participants.

The Office of Higher Education in Bucharest recently did a study of academic needs in Eastern Europe. The resulting report stated that contrary to current thinking, the needs are still very strong. However, the response from Western Europe has been quite small. Eastern European countries have great need of assistance in the areas of ecological studies, all technological areas, and languages. Universities are currently trying to set up their own shops since no help is being provided for the existing ones.

Also of note for this study is the Commonwealth Association of Universities in London. They administer an exchange program called CHESS. (I will contact this organization-SR). Also the Economic Community has the Erasmus Program.

Finally, Mr. Power recommended that I contact Akilo Hapti at the City University of New York. He administers the Africa Ph.D. program. Mr. Powers sees great potential in any program for retired professors. In Europe faculty retire earlier now and Mr. Powers anticipates that the response from this sector would be substantial.

(NOTE: Logistically, The UNITWIN program seems to come closest to the ideas put forth in the focus groups. It is extremely flexible, has substantial institutional support, and builds upon a pre-existing initiative coming from both sides. However, two major points of difference would be: 1) the programs vulnerability in terms of it's private funding. 2) it's mission being more "mutual benefits of academic exchange", rather than specifically contributing to local development through education.

Appendix R

US-AID Feasibility Study
Notes/AMIDEAST
August 3, 1992

Leslie Nucho - Director of Publications, AMIDEAST
Stuart Richardson - CIEE

Ms. Nucho said that university linkages supported by AMID-East are documented only in passing, but that she would gather as much information as possible and send it to CIEE.

AMID-East is a private, non-profit organization begun in 1950, involved in a variety of aspects of international exchange between the United States and the Middle East and Northern Africa. There is a two-way flow in most of their programs, however the ratio is heavily slanted toward the US-bound exchanges. Most of their largest programs are funded by AID.

AMID-East's main activity is the placement of foreign students entering the US, as well as the administration of the Fulbright program for US-bound Middle-Eastern scholars and the administration of entrance and aptitude exams.

Ms. Nucho said that given the burst of renewed interest in "global education" AMID-East would be very supportive of any program contributing to the placement of US professors/scholars in universities in the Middle East. The organization has tried to make the number of exchanges in each direction more equal in recent years but government funds have been limited and private foundations have a heavy bias toward US-bound activities.

Also, there is increased hesitation and reluctance on the side of American universities to become involved with a program in this area of the world, given it's political instability.

The most interesting distinction between this conversation and others I have had recently was that Ms. Nucho commented that it is likely that many universities in the gulf countries could pay for participation in this program. She also commented that general interest would be certain.

Ms. Nucho sees one stumbling block being language. Since most of the universities in the Middle East are public, classes are taught in Arabic. In some countries there are classes in French (especially for Science/Technology classes) but Jordan, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, and Kuwait are the only countries that would probably have use for a professor who doesn't speak arabic. Ms. Nucho said that most US professors who do speak arabic fluently are area specialists who might not fit the "development oriented" needs of this program.

Appendix R-2

Another interesting point: Ms. Nucho said that the current overall academic emphasis in this region is the nationalization of the teaching core. She said that most schools have succeeded in this mission, even though most of the teachers, while being nationals were educated overseas. However, Ms. Nucho said, there is always a need to see different methods and views, which should be as much an objective of the program as the specialty being taught.

Appendix S

US-AID Feasibility Study
Notes/USIA
August 4, 1992

Dr. Winnie Emoungu - USIA
Stuart Richardson - CIEE

Dr. Emoungu began by saying that the USIA University Linkages program has become very selective regarding which countries they send scholars to. They have essentially divided Africa into prioritized regions and recruit and send according to those priorities. The "first priority" group is made up of nine countries which are considered to be adequately functional, possessing enough institutional structure and support services to guarantee a successful exchange.

The Anglophone countries targeted are: Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania.

The Francophone countries targeted are: Ghana, Nigeria, and Senegal. (NOTE: The Ivory Coast had been also been targeted but their program has been suspended until the university re-opens)

The "southern region" countries targeted are: South Africa, Botswana, and Zimbabwe.

There is then a category of countries where exchange is maintained but is not considered priority: Guinea, Lesotho, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, and Uganda.

The final category is made up of countries for which the organization will cover listings but will not provide recruitment due to a variety of complications: Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Congo, Ivory Coast, Gabon, Swaziland, Togo. (Swaziland, for example, did not wish to have US professors on it's campuses).

Dr. Emoungu said that the greatest incentive to an American professor working overseas is the opportunity to conduct research. Therefore, the grants are classified as "Research and Teaching" grants. Most US institutions do not consider teaching overseas a factor in career advancement when it is not done in conjunction with some form of field research. To that end, the program stipulates that visiting professors are given adequate time to complete their research.

The program also provides a book allowance, whereby the professor can order books through USIA contact agencies. The books are sent out and are charged directly back to the grant.

In terms of language, English is spoken at all levels in the Anglophone countries. Finding French-speaking professors to teach in the Francophone countries has been more difficult. Some Francophone countries are implementing programs in which classes can be taught in English (i.e. Senegal).

Appendix S-2

Field support has often been provided by USIA representatives working at local embassies. They often assist with the shipment of books, mail services and general use of the commissary.

The host university provides university housing for about 90% of the placements. Renting a private apartment can be very costly since most landlords ask that rent be paid an entire year in advance, whereas grant money is paid monthly.

Dr. Emoungu's strongest recommendation is that current exchange programs continue to work together. This has already happened successfully between USIA and USAID in the case of a professor teaching in Ghana. USAID had an interest in improving the level of communication in the field of economic policy, and USIA was able to recruit a suitable candidate. The two agencies collaborated on the grant with USIA providing travel and insurance costs and AID providing the stipend and materials.

Also, the USAID mission in Nigeria contributed to a program that funded people going there to research and teach courses related to the development of democracy in that country.

Dr. Emoungu's recommended talking to William Saint at the World Bank.

Appendix T

US-AID Feasibility Study
Notes/African-American Institute
August 5, 1992

Jane Marten - Senior Programs Officer
Edith Katz - CIEE
Stuart Richardson - CIEE

The Institute, founded in 1953 is a non-profit organization, administering exchange programs and providing support services for the undergraduate, graduate and faculty levels. They are responsible for the administration of Fulbright grants to Liberia. Most of their other programs deal only with US-bound students and faculty.

Through the graduate level program, undergraduate students are selected by USAID missions and visiting Deans for grants to come to the US for graduate level work. Since the USAID mission serves as the intermediary there is no contact between the African-America Institute and the African university where the student received the undergraduate degree. According to Dr. Marten, the program depends entirely on the USAID missions "buying into" the program. Also, it is the missions that determine the programs priorities in terms of discipline. In most cases the graduate work funded is in the fields of Sciences, Management, and Agriculture.

Dr. Marten strongly recommends university housing for visiting professors. Firstly because private housing is prohibitively expensive. Secondly because a sense of community is very important within the faculty and "living in a private house with a generator" sets you aside in a way which is unfreindly.

Dr. Marten noted that there is an interesting linkage which exists between Coddington College, Liberia, which is the only private institution in Africa, and St. Pauls University, where they have a division "in exile". She also noted that the Association of Episcopal Colleges has particular interest in the Liberian region.

Dr. Marten said that English is used at most of the universities that she visited.

Dr. Marten agreed that administrational support is practically non-existent. Teachers going to Africa must be made aware of this in advance. She also agreed with the focus-group findings that the topping-off idea is too limiting, the program definition should be expanded to accomodate a wide variety of situations. Sustainibility is sometimes built into a program, she said, because many professors do repeat assignments if the experience has been positive.

Appendix U

US-AID Feasibility Study
Notes/UCLA
August 4, 1992

Dr. Elwin Svenson - Vice Chancellor for Institutional Relations
Henry D. Weaver - CIEE

He reported that UCLA at one time had a "topping-up" program where they would assist people on programs that did not supply adequate payment, such as sabbatical leaves, Fulbright leaves, etc. He felt it worked quite well.

He suggested that the US-AID program for "topping- up" salaries should be more than a year relationship for continuity. That is, one might go over for a period but then continue contact with the institution over several years. He strongly recommended that people should be selected initially for a relatively short period. This is a relatively inexpensive way to send someone over since it does not normally involve travel or housing for a spouse. It allows both the host institution and the person going over to mutually explore the possibility of a longer-term relationship. The same person might well be supported later for a semester or a year.

He emphasized strongly the necessity for an adequate telecommunications link. He mentioned services such as PSAT in the Pacific, or OPTEL. Reliable communication becomes particularly important for the follow-up of activities. He cited an example of seven island nations gathering at the East-West Center for a two-week seminar. Participants were able to follow up on the ideas that were exchanged by bitnet, fax, or speakerphones. He felt strongly that if the telecommunications were not in place one should not work with the institution involved.

On the issue of whether such a program would work best with grants being given to individuals or to institutions, he responded that the individual grants would probably work best for short summer programs or workshops and that they might in general be limited to those. They would often result in further planning which could lead to additional short-term involvement over a period of years or to longer institutional involvement. He strongly recommended that institutional relationships seek the possibility of consortial arrangements whenever possible.

He expressed the opinion that the departmental participation becomes crucial in a research university setting. If a department is willing to sign on a responsibility for a three to five year commitment the project will likely be sustained and move ahead. He cited SOCCIS, the southern California International group that has developed a good mechanism to work with large and small institutions together. Small colleges, junior colleges and even public school superintendents would have something to give via consortial models.

In responding to how institutions might best help development in their countries, he cites the Agriculture or Land Grant model where work was carried on with secondary schools, with state institutions and with vocational training. The land grant model combines research (which can be quite primitive) with communication to those in need of the service. This idea could be used

for many development areas other than agriculture.

He emphasized the importance of involving research that is carried out jointly between someone from a US institution and someone abroad. A recent UCLA project in China involving 60 participants required that research be performed in combination with the academic program. This lead to a level of involvement that gave much better results than a similar and much larger project that was going on simultaneously that did not require research.

He suggested that the administration of such a program might well delegate the responsibility for a specific country or two to a given consortium. For example, the HBCU's might well represent a consortium that could work well with African institutions.

Evaluations should be based on the student outcomes that were planned in the original proposal.

The theme of flexibility came through his comments frequently in relationship to almost every issue.

We discussed the desirability of involving retired people and he commented that they are motivated like any others but they no longer need promotions. However, they continue to seek emotional investment and represent a large source with interest in doing this kind of work.

For retired people he suggested that the tie-in might better be with a consortium which would get around the politics of individual departments. Once the faculty member has retired, he or she is no longer in the mainstream of departmental politics and may be pushed aside.

Appendix V

US-AID Feasibility Study
Notes/ California State University, Long Beach

Maurice Harari - Dean, Center for International Education
Henry D. Weaver - CIEE

Dr. Harari has been nominated for election as Secretary General for the International Association of University Presidents. He feels that IAUP would be a group of universities with much interest in cooperating with a USAID program.

In commenting about the need of institutions in less developed countries for US professors to assist in relatively short-term assignments (1 year or less) he was quite positive in feeling that many institutions would find this helpful. He went on to say, "I would find this possibility an extremely desirable one at both ends. For those returning to their home institution this contribution to the internationalization of US higher education would be very substantial."

He discussed the Overseas Educational Service (OES) which was begun in early 1963 by Education and World Affairs. EWA had joint funding from the Ford and Carnegie Foundations. By the summer of 1963 two additional staff were added and Dr. Harari was made Vice President with responsibility for OES. The mission of OES was to provide universities in developing countries with US professors. The Carnegie Foundation continued to support the office of OES/EWA as it grew to include an Executive Director (part-time) and three or four professional staff. Carnegie did not intend to fund it on a long term basis but wanted to initiate something that would be useful for AID and USIA. It started with a five-year contract and was later renewed for an additional five.

During the 1960's expatriate staff were highly needed in many less developed countries, particularly in Africa. OES had funds to top-up salaries of people from US institutions and in some cases to provide total funding. The need now is for shorter term staff rather then people going for multiple year appointments.

Dr. Harari identified two major problems that OES experienced. First, that OES had too limited a say in the plans of developing countries. AID, OES and local universities often had different views. Second, not being a primary goal of EWA, OES was given too little attention.

He sees the overall situation as much different today than it was in the 1960's. In 1960 there was a "peace corps" mentality and many people were eager to work overseas for little money and without regard for spouses' salaries or length of stays, etc. Now, although there is more mobility by US faculty with more being available to go abroad, there is need for more salary and planning.

Another problem was the variety of funding available to people which resulted in some competition. AID would pay the home salary plus 10%, whereas the amount that OES could offer was lower.

The complexity of the program also became a stumbling block. Three contracts had to be prepared for each placement. One between the professor and OES (for the topping up salary for example), another between OES and the host university and the last between the host university and the individual professor. If something went wrong with any of these contracts OES received the complaints.

Additional complications were added when institutions began to juggle offers between OES and British programs. Eventually the British and OES coordinated their efforts and let the person choose one program but not play one off against the other.

At it's height, the program was placing approximately 80 people per year.

OES was an operational part of EWA and when funds were short EWA opted to continue it's policy work rather than operations and so OES was discontinued.

Appendix W

US-AID Feasibility Study

MEMO:

To: Henry Weaver
From: Stuart Richardson
Date: August 18, 1992
Re: Linkage Programs

Here is an updated tally of current linkages between US institutions and institutions in developing countries/newly emerging democracies listed by source. The total identified comes to 593. A tally by region is listed on page 2.

USIA-University Affiliation Program[30]

Africa	59
Central and South America	58
East Asia	50
Europe	65
North Africa, Near East, South Asia	35

AMIDEAST[28]

Middle East/US linkages	4
Middle East/Other	7

Opportunities In Africa[11]

Africa	20

UNESCO - Unitwin Program[32]

Africa	12
Asia	1
South America	3
Middle East	2

Appendix W-2

AID/University Development Linkages Project[29]

Africa	6
Asia	4
Central & Latin America	6

The Whole World Handbook/CIEE[31]

Eastern Europe/Former USSR	45
Africa/Middle East	33
Asia (South, East, and South East)	66
The Caribbean	9
Central & South Amercia	108

TOTAL IDENTIFIED: **593**

From Where Walls Once Stood[12] (p1), "176 US institutions reported on some 333 collaborative projects with East Central European (ECE) partners." Since this number probably includes those reported above we are using that figure for linkages in East Europe/Former USSR.

TALLY BY REGION:

Africa (Sub-Saharan & North)/Middle East	178
Central and South America	184
Eastern Europe/Former USSR	333
Asia (South, East, and South East)	121

ADJUSTED TOTAL IDENTIFIED: **816**

APPENDIX X

AMIDEAST
1100 17th Street, N.W. • Washington, D.C. 20036-4601 • (202) 785-0022 • Telex 440160 • FAX (202) 822-6563

August 3, 1992

Mr. Stuart Richardson
CIEE
205 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10017

Dear Mr. Richardson:

I've looked through information we have here, and although I've been able to come up with a few citations, I'm afraid I don't have very extensive data. Listed below are brief descriptions of the linkages I've been able to identify--I'm certain there are more. I've also indicated linkages with European and other universities, FYI.

Linkages between U.S. and Middle Eastern Universities

University of Pittsburgh/*Ecole des Sciences de l'Information*, Morocco: for exchange of faculty and students; cooperation in publications & research. (1988)

Ministry of Higher Education & Scientific Research (Tunisia)/American Institute of Maghrebian Studies (AIMS): for establishment of academic research center in Tunisia. (for additional information, contact Dr. William Zartman at the Johns Hopkins School for Advanced International Studies, Washington, DC) (1985 or 1986)

Institute of Diplomacy & International Affairs (Jordan): planning committee consisted of, among others, representatives from the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University; institute also had (?) cooperative agreement with Johns Hopkins University. (1984)

Arabic Bilingual Material Development Center (Jordan)/University of Michigan School of Education: joint effort to standardize an Arabic picture vocabulary test. (1983)

Linkages between Middle Eastern and Other Universities

University of Jordan/University of Ulm (Germany): for scientific cooperation, including teacher exchanges.

Zagazig University (Egypt)/University of North Wales: for agricultural and forestry research.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

St. Joseph University (Lebanon)/Faculty of Arts & Sciences, Laval University (Quebec): for faculty & student exchange, especially in social work.

Yarmouk University (Jordan)/McGill University (Quebec): for cooperation in various academic activities, especially in engineering and medical fields.

Arabian Gulf University (Bahrain)/Newcastle University (Australia): for curriculum development, exchange of expertise. (Arabian Gulf University is now defunct, and campus used by Bahrain University)

Gulf Polytechnic University (Bahrain)/Institute of Sccience & Technology of the University of Manchester (England): for staff exchange and cooperation in joint research projects. (Gulf Polytechnic merged with the College of Health Sciences to form Bahrain University.)

National Schools of Public Administration (Morocco and Quebec): for cooperation in organizing seminars and exchange of professors. (1984)

I'm sorry I couldn't provide more; as I mentioned to you on the phone, we don't have a formal means of tracking linkages. I'll let you know if I find out anything else. In the meantime, I will transmit the letter you sent to our field offices in the Middle East and North Africa. If we're able to obtain any letters in response, I'll forward them to you immediately.

Sincerely,

Leslie S. Nucho
Director
Information Services

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX Y

UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT LINKAGES PROJECT
FY 1991 COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT AWARDS

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
CENTER FOR UNIVERSITY COOPERATION IN DEVELOPMENT

U.S. INSTITUTIONS	DEVELOPING COUNTRY INSTITUTIONS	COUNTRIES	FIELDS OF ACTIVITY
· Boston University	· Tribhuvan University	· Nepal	· Health
· Central State University (HBCU)	· University of Science and Technology	· Ghana	· Environment · Management · Engineering
· Harvard University	· Instituto Nacional de Salud Publica · Edwardo Mondlane University	· Mexico · Mozambique	· Health
· Johns Hopkins University	· El Colegio de Mexico	· Mexico	· Health · Population
· Johns Hopkins University	· University of Maidugari · University of Ilorin · University of Benin	· Nigeria	· Health
· Morgan State University (HBCU)	· Jahangirnagar University	· Bangladesh	· Rural Development · Population
· University of California-Davis	· Instituto de Nutricion de Central America y Panama (INCAP) at the University of San Carlos	· Guatemala	· Nutrition · Health
· University of Massachusetts	· Tribhuvan University	· Nepal	· Literacy related to Rural and Community Development
· University of Montana	· University College of Belize	· Belize	· Environment · Forestry · Management
· University of North Carolina	· Indian Institute of Health Management Research	· India	· Health · Management
· University of North Carolina (lead) · University of Pennsylvania	· University of Javeriana	· Colombia	· Health
· University of Pennsylvania	· University of Botswana · University of Ibadan · University of Tunis	· Botswana · Nigeria · Tunisia	· Literacy related to Agriculture and Health
· Worcester Polytechnic Institute	· Escuela Superior Politecnica del Litoral	· Ecuador	· Environment · Business · Management

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TOTAL

APPENDIX Z

UNIVERSITY AFFILIATIONS PROGRAM
DIRECTORY OF GRANTS
1982 - 1991

Advising, Teaching and Specialized Programs Division
Office of Academic Programs
Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AFRICA

FY	INSTITUTIONS	COUNTRY OR REGION	DISCIPLINE	CONTRACT NO./ GRANT AWARD
82	U. of Michigan/ Natl. U. of Benin	BENIN	American/African Studies	IA-20340-19-G $50,000
	SUNY-Stony Brook/ U. of Botswana	BOTSWANA	African Studies	IA-20341-19-G $50,000
	U. of Iowa/ U. of Ouagadougou	BURKINA FASO	African Studies/ Art/French	IA-20334-19-G $49,485
	Ball State U./ U. of Yaounde	CAMEROON	Interdisciplinary Studies	IA-20337-19-G $50,000
	Johns Hopkins-SAIS/ U. of Nairobi	KENYA	International Studies	IA-20339-19-G $50,000
	Western Carolina U./ U. of Swaziland	SWAZILAND	African Studies	IA-20333-19-G $49,529
	Brown U./ U. Dar es Salaam	TANZANIA	Archaeology	IA-20338-19-G $50,000
	UCLA/ U. de Benin in Togo	TOGO	African Studies/ Linguistics	IA-20336-19-G $45,900
	Duke U./ U. of Zimbabwe	ZIMBABWE	Social Sciences	IA-20335-19-G $50,000
	Penn. State U./ U. of Zimbabwe	ZIMBABWE	Business Education	IA-20332-19-G $50,000
83	Penn. State U./ U. of Yaounde	CAMEROON	Humanities	IA-20797-19-G $50,000
	Penn. State-Capitol/ Marien Ngouabi U.	CONGO	Management Studies	IA-20807-19-G $49,786
	U. of Illinois/ U. of Abidjan	IVORY COAST	Social Sciences	IA-20804-19-G $48,426
	U. Dist. of Col./ U. of Nairobi	KENYA	Adult Education	IA-20824-19-G $50,000
	U. of Montana/ U. of Calabar	NIGERIA	Public Policy/ International Studies	IA-20792-19-G $50,000

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FY	INSTITUTIONS	COUNTRY OR REGION	DISCIPLINE	CONTRACT NO. GRANT AWARD
83	U. of South Carolina Somali Nat. U.	SOMALIA	International Affairs	IA-20799-19-G $47,600
	Michigan St. U./ U. of Zimbabwe	ZIMBABWE	Social Sciences	IA-20798-19-G $50,000
84	U. of Wisconsin-Mad./ U. of Burundi	BURUNDI	Afro-American Studies	IA-21407-19-G $50,000
	Murray State U./ Kenyatta U.	KENYA	Business Education	IA-21384-19-G $49,900
	West Virginia U./ Bayero U. Kano	NIGERIA	African Studies/ Education	IA-21398-19-G $49,600
	Tuskegee Institute/ U. of Dakar	SENEGAL	African Studies English	IA-21387-19-G $49,400
85	Michigan State U./ Addis Ababa U.	ETHIOPIA	African Studies/ Anthropology	IA-22015-19-G $50,000
	Atlanta U./ Nat. U. of Lesotho	LESOTHO	Development Studies	IA-21999-19-G $49,869
	Boston U./ U. of Niamey	NIGER	Social Sciences	IA-22000-19-G $50,000
	U of Pennsylvania/ U. of Ibadan	NIGERIA	African Studies	IA-22020-19-G $50,000
	U. of Denver/ U. of Port Harcourt	NIGERIA	African Studies	IA-22003-19-G $50,000
86	Indiana U./ U. of Malawi	MALAWI	Library Science	IA-AEGH-G6192676 $49,902
	Penn. St. U./ U. of Niamey	NIGER	ESL	IA-AEGH-G6192649 $50,000
	Purdue U./ Ahmadu Bello U.	NIGERIA	Humanities	IA-AEGH-G6192661 $49,980
	U. Minnesota-Morris/ Niger St. Coll.	NIGERIA	Intl. Studies	IA-AEGH-G6192651 $49,960
87	U. of Florida/ U. of Yaounde	CAMEROON	Journalism/ African Studies	IA-ASJL-G7192991 $49,870
	Michigan State U./ U. of Dakar	SENEGAL	Interdisciplinary Studies	IA-ASJL-G7192990 $49,713

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FY	INSTITUTIONS	COUNTRY OR REGION	DISCIPLINE	CONTRACT NO. GRANT AWARD
87	U. of Missouri/ U. of Western Cape	SOUTH AFRICA	Interdisciplinary Studies	IA-ASJL-G7193007 $50,000
	U. of Wisconsin/ U. of Dar es Salaam	TANZANIA	History/Literature/ Music/Swahili	IA-ASJL-G7193019 $49,098
88	Penn. St. U./ U. of Burundi	BURUNDI	Economics	IA-ASJL-G8193317 $59,700
	Delta College/ Rift Valley Institute	KENYA	Education	IA-ASJL-G8193309 $50,000
	Moorhead St. U./ Natl. Teachers Coll.	LESOTHO	Education	IA-ASLJ-G8193315 $49,800
	U. of Iowa/ U. of Ibadan	NIGERIA	Social Sciences	IA-ASJL-G8193331 $50,000
89	Boston University/ U. of Addis Ababa	ETHIOPIA	Social Sciences	G9193684 $59,936
	Indiana University/ University of Ghana	GHANA	Humanities	G9193747 $56,820
	U. of Connecticut/ U. of Mauritius	MAURITIUS	Women's Studies	G9193669 $59,800
	U. of Missouri/ U. of Western Cape	SOUTH AFRICA	Interdisciplinary Studies	G9193673 $60,000
90	South Carolina St./ U. of Sierra Leone	SIERRA LEONE	Business Admin.	IA-ASJL-G0190250 $68,601
	Georgia Southern U./ U. of Zululand	SOUTH AFRICA	Education	IA-ASJL-G0190271 $74,240
	U. of Florida/ Makerere U.	UGANDA	Environmental Science/ Law	IA-ASJL-G0190252 $72,600
91	E. Washington U./ U. of Cape Coast	GHANA	African/Afro-American Studies	IA-ASPS-G1190251 $68,804
	U. of Illinois-UC/ Egerton U.	KENYA	African Studies	IA-ASPS-G1190252 $69,950
	U. of Wisconsin-Park./ Obafemi Awolowo U.	NIGERIA	American/African Studies	IA-ASCS-G1190241 $69,953
	Indiana U./ U. of Witwatersrand	SOUTH AFRICA	Education	IA-ASPS-G1190256 $67,434

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AMERICAN REPUBLICS

FY	INSTITUTIONS	COUNTRY OR REGION	DISCIPLINE	CONTRACT NO. GRANT AWARD
83	U. of Tennessee/ Fed. U. Ceara	BRAZIL	Social Sciences	IA-20796-19-G $50,000
	U. of Alabama/ Fed. U. of Pernambuco	BRAZIL	Social Sciences	IA-20830-19-G $47,700
	Temple U./ U. of Brasilia	BRAZIL	Federalism Studies	IA-20931-19-G $48,107
	Dallas Comm. Coll./ Colombian Ass. U.	COLOMBIA	Music/Social Sciences	IA-20833-19-G $45,600
84	Arizona State U./ Catholic U.	BOLIVIA	Business/Soc. Sciences	IA-21406-19-G $49,534
	San Diego State U./ Fed. U. of Maranhao	BRAZIL	Humanities	IA-21409-19-G $50,000
	U. of New Mexico/ U. of Sao Paulo	BRAZIL	Social Sciences	IA-21382-19-G $47,010
	Massachusetts Cons./ U. de los Andes	COLOMBIA	Social Sciences/ Humanities	IA-20825-19-G $49,300
	U. of Kansas/ U. of Costa Rica	COSTA RICA	Humanities/ Social Sciences	IA-21417-19-G $48,005
	U. of Florida/ Pedro H. Urena U.	DOM. REP.	Archaeology/History	IA-21397-19-G $49,846
	UCLA/ Nat. Aut. U.	MEXICO	History	IA-21386-19-G $49,394
	U. of Pittsburgh/ U. of the Pacific	PERU	Econ./Intl. Relations	IA-21381-19-G $47,737
	U. of Minnesota/ Catholic U. Uruguay	URUGUAY	Social Sciences/ Communications	IA-21428-19-G $47,416
85	Johns Hopkins-SAIS/ U. of Belgrano	ARGENTINA	Intl. Relations	IA-22043-19-G $44,950
	Murray State U./ Belize College	BELIZE	Business/Education	IA-22047-19-G $49,068
	New York U./ U. of Sao Paulo	BRAZIL	Law/Bicentennial	IA-22049-19-G $30,450

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FY	INSTITUTIONS	COUNTRY OR REGION	DISCIPLINE	CONTRACT NO. GRANT AWARD
85	SUNY-Albany/ U. of Costa Rica	COSTA RICA	Social Sciences	IA-22053-19-G $50,000
	U. of Florida/ U. Marroquin-Landivar	GUATEMALA-HONDURAS	Archaeology/History	IA-22041-19-G $48,270
	Florida Intl. U./ Natl. Aut. U.	HONDURAS	Social Sciences	IA-22042-19-G $49,795
	Johns Hopkins U./ U. West Indies	JAMAICA	Humanities	IA-22044-19-G $48,800
	U. of Kansas/ U. West Indies	JAMAICA	Educ./History	IA-22045-19-G $50,000
	U. of New Mexico/ Nat. Autonomous U.	MEXICO	Social Sciences	IA-22048-19-G $49,394
	U. of Cincinnati/ U. of Nuevo Leon	MEXICO	Social Sciences	IA-22040-19-G $50,000
	Michigan State U./ U. of Panama	PANAMA	Educ./Population	IA-22046-19-G $48,915
	U. of Iowa/ U. de Los Andes	VENEZUELA	Economics	IA-22006-19-G $48,760
86	U. of North Fla./ Belize Colleges	BELIZE	Business	IA-AEGH-G6192654 $49,932
	Colorado Sch. of Mines/ F. Us. Para & Maranao	BRAZIL	Intl. Studies	IA-AEGH-G6192656 $49,890
	U. of Alabama-Birm./ Fed. Fluminense	BRAZIL	History/Geography	IA-AEGH-G6192677 $47,840
	U. Illinois-Urbana/ Pontifical Catholic U.	BRAZIL	History/Pol. Sci.	IA-AEGH-G6192666 $46,453
	Vanderbilt U./ U. de los Andes	COLOMBIA	History/Pol. Science/ Law	IA-AEGH-G6192662 $46,170
	CASA/U. Javeriana/ U. de Costa Rica	COSTA RICA	U.S./Latin American Studies	IA-AEGH-G6192668 $49,000
	Utah State U./ U. de Costa Rica	COSTA RICA	Interdisciplinary Studies	IA-AEGH-G6192659 $49,950
	San Diego State U./ El Col. de Mexico	MEXICO	History	IA-AEGH-G6192650 $49,997

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FY	INSTITUTIONS	COUNTRY OR REGION	DISCIPLINE	CONTRACT NO. GRANT AWARD
86	U. of New Mexico/ U. de Guanajuato	MEXICO	Law	IA-AEGH-G6192678 $48,553
87	U. of North Carolina/ U. of Belgrano	ARGENTINA	U.S.-Argentine Political Economics	IA-ASJL-G7192998 $49,860
	Michigan State U./ U. of Sao Paulo	BRAZIL	Journalism/ Communications	IA-ASJL-G193009 $46,364
	Colorado Sch. of Mines/ U. Antofagasta-La Serena	CHILE	Social Sciences/ Mining	IA-ASJL-G7199301 $43,724
	Texas Tech. U./ U. of Guanajuato	MEXICO	Architecture/ Hist. Preservation	IA-ASJL-G7192999 $49,878
88	Colorado Sch. of Mines/ U. Nac. Cuyo	ARGENTINA	Economics/ Energy Studies	IA-ASJL-G8193328 $49,994
	Rochester Inst. Tech./ U. Externado	COLOMBIA	Communications	IA-ASJL-G8193325 $47,475
	U. of Pittsburgh/ U. Madre y Maestra	DOM. REP.	Economics	IA-ASJL-G8193326 $48,638
	UCLA/ U. Nac. Aut. de Mexico/ U. Aut. Metropolitania	MEXICO	Economics	IA-ASJL-G8193327 $50,000
	U. of North Carolina/ U. Nac. Republica	URUGUAY	Intl. Relations	IA-ASJL-G8193329 $49,680
89	Texas Southern U./ U. College of Belize	BELIZE	Law/ Labor Relations	IA-ASJL-G9193680 $47,040
	U. of North Carolina/ Fac. de Ciencias Sociales	CHILE	Social Sciences	IA-ASJL-G9193671 $49,980
	City College of CUNY/ Aut. U. of Santo Domingo	DOM. REP.	Environmental Economics	IA-ASJL-G9193674 $50,000
	U. of Arizona/ U. La Salle -Mexico/ U. de Navarra-Spain	MEXICO SPAIN	1992 Columbian Quincentennial	G9193670 $80,000
	El Paso Comm. Coll./ U. de Juarez-Mexico/ U. de Santiago-Spain	MEXICO SPAIN	1992 Columbian Quincentennial	G9193668 $77,100
90	U. of Florida/ Fed. U. Minas Gerais	BRAZIL	Ecology/Environmental Sciences	IA-ASJL-G0190274 $74,990

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FY	INSTITUTIONS	COUNTRY OR REGION	DISCIPLINE	CONTRACT NO. GRANT AWARD
90	Central Conn. St. U./ Coll. of the Bahamas/ Sam Sharpe-Teachers Coll.	BAHAMAS JAMAICA	Teacher Education	IA-ASJL-G0190267 $85,480
	U. of Wisconsin-Mad./ Ctr. Agronomo de Invest.	COSTA RICA	Environmental Studies	IA-ASJL-G0190275 $99,821
	Ohio State U./ Enriquez Urena U./ Escuela de Estudios Hispanos	DOM. REP. SPAIN	1992 Columbian Quincentennial (Social Sciences)	IA-ASJL-G0190268 $79,986
91	Cornell U./ Fed. U. of Rio de Jan.	BRAZIL	Environmental Studies	IA-ASPS-G1190253 $68,980
	Colorado State U./ Fed. U. of Vicosa	BRAZIL	Environmental Studies	IA-ASPS-G1190266 $66,764
	U. of Tennessee-Knox./ U. of Amazonas	BRAZIL	Environmental Studies	IA-ASCS-G1190242 $54,600
	Georgetown U./ Pontificia U. Catolica de Chile	CHILE	Political Science	IA-ASPS-G1190267 $65,780
	U. of Connecticut/ U. Simon Bolivar	VENEZUELA	American/Latin American Studies	IA-ASCS-G1190268 $68,662
	U. of Miami/ U. Central de Ven.	VENEZUELA	American/Latin American Studies	IA-ASPS-G1190260 $69,520

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EAST ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

FY	INSTITUTIONS	COUNTRY OR REGION	DISCIPLINE	CONTRACT NO. GRANT AWARD
83	Ball State U./ U. of Airlangga	INDONESIA	Sociology	IA-20826-19-G $50,000
	U. of Nebraska-Omaha City U. of Manila	PHILIPPINES	U.S. Studies/ Dev. Studies	IA-20821-19-G $50,000
	Oberlin College/ Nanjing U.	PRC	East Asian Studies	IA-20785-19-G $45,600
	Princeton U./ Fudan U.	PRC	Intl. Studies	IA-20793-19-G $50,000
	U. of Pittsburgh/ Zhongdhan U.	PRC	Anthropology/ Sociology	IA-20823-19-G $48,068
	Mankato State U./ Tamkang U.	THAILAND	Mass Communications/ Theater Arts	IA-20812-19-G $49,980
84	U. of Hawaii-Manoa/ Rangoon U.	BURMA	Education/ Literature	IA-21393-19-G $50,000
	U. of Iowa/ IKIP Yogyakarta	INDONESIA	Science Educ./ Languages/Art	IA-21389-19-G $49,500
	U. of Hawaii-Manoa/ U. of Papua N. Guinea	PAPUA NEW GUINEA	Education/ Pacific History	IA-21392-19-G $50,000
	Ohio University/ De la Salle U.	PHILIPPINES	Sociology/ Anthropology	IA-21383-19-G $47,894
	Virginia Tech./ Xavier U.	PHILIPPINES	Education/ Literature	IA-21385-19-G $50,000
85	U. of Hawaii-Manoa/ Hiroshima U.	JAPAN	English/Law	IA-22005-19-G $49,367
	Ohio State U./ U. of Auckland	NEW ZEALAND	Education	IA-22017-19-G $49,939
	Penn. State U./ Nankai U.	PRC	Economics/ History	IA-22019-19-G $48,960
	UCLA/ Natl. U. Singapore	SINGAPORE	Chinese/ Singapore Studies	IA-22002-19-G $47,250

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FY	INSTITUTIONS	COUNTRY OR REGION	DISCIPLINE	CONTRACT NO. GRANT AWARD
85	U. of Illinois-UC/ Yonsei U.	SOUTH KOREA	U.S./Korean Studies	IA-22007-19-G $47,345
86	Coll. of William & Mary/ U. of Adelaide/ Flinders U.	AUSTRALIA	Law/History	IA-AEGH-G6192751 $59,990
	Penn. State U./ U. of Melbourne	AUSTRALIA	History/ Political Science	IA-AEGH-G6192652 $54,800
	Lansing Comm. Coll./ Shiga Prefectural Jr.	JAPAN	American Studies	IA-AEGH-G6192671 $59,120
	Des Moines Comm. Coll./ Yamanashi Gakuin U.	JAPAN	Education	IA-AEGH-G6192673 $59,960
	U. of Kansas/ Korea U.	SOUTH KOREA	Social Sciences	IA-AEGH-G6192663 $59,485
	U. Illinois-Chicago/ Chiang Mai U.	THAILAND	American Studies	IA-AEGH-G6192667 $51,550
	Northwest Intl. Ed./ Mahidol U.	THAILAND	American Studies	IA-AEGH-G6192675 $60,000
	Illinois State U./ Srinakharinwirot U.	THAILAND	American Studies	IA-AEGH-G6192675 $55,448
	Northern Illinois U. Thammasat U.	THAILAND	Thai Studies	IA-AEGH-G6192655 $56,000
87	U. of Michigan/ U. of Philippines	PHILIPPINES	Asian/U.S. Studies	IA-ASJL-F7192982 $39,963
	U. of Hawaii-Manoa/ U. of San Carlos	PHILIPPINES	Philippine Studies	IA-ASJL-G7192995 $55,366
	U. Colorado-Denver/ Liaoning U.	PRC	Intl. Relations	IA-ASJL-G7193010 $58,002
	Southern Illinois U. Northeast Normal U.	PRC	Intl. Relations	IA-ASJL-G7193020 $59,040
	UCLA/ Seoul Natl. U.	SOUTH KOREA	Korean Studies	IA-ASJL-G7193012 $58,260

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FY	INSTITUTIONS	COUNTRY OR REGION	DISCIPLINE	CONTRACT NO. GRANT AWARD
88	U. of South Carolina/ U. of the Philippines	PHILIPPINES	Education	IA-ASJL-G8193311 $55,950
	UCLA/ SW China Inst.	PRC	Law	IA-ASJL-G8193308 $56,000
	St. Louis/Washington Sichuan University	PRC	Law	IA-ASJL-G8193314 $51,000
	U. of Hawaii-Manoa/ Dankook University	SOUTH KOREA	Education/ Curriculum Dev.	IA-ASJL-G8193319 $60,000
	Utah St. U./ Pusan Natl. U.	SOUTH KOREA	Education	IA-ASJL-G8193321 $59,900
	Towson St. U./ Sung Kyun Kwan U.	SOUTH KOREA	Interdisciplinary Studies	IA-ASJL-G8193312 $58,770
	U.S. Intl. U./ National U. of Samoa	WESTERN SAMOA	Education Admin.	IA-ASJL-G8193313 $60,000
89	U. of Texas-Austin/ U. of Sydney	AUSTRALIA	Social Sciences	G9193700 $60,000
	U. of Oregon/ College of Micronesia	MICRONESIA	Area Studies	G9193699 $59,472
	Michigan State U./ Chulalongkorn U.	THAILAND	Social Sciences	G9193701 $59,550
90	Bethany College/ U. of Canterbury	NEW ZEALAND	American/ New Zealand Studies	IA-ASJL-G0190270 $71,236
	Southern Oregon St./ Fujian Teachers College	PRC	Social Sciences	IA-ASJL-G0190272 $75,000
	Bentley College/ Yunnan U.	PRC	Bus. Mgt./Bus. Law/ For. Invest./Intl. Trade	IA-ASJL-G0190093 $60,000
	North Carolina St. U./ Liaoning U.	PRC	Law/ Economics	IA-ASJL-G0190094 $58,300
	U. of Alaska-Fair./ Xinjiang Coll. of Finance	PRC	Business Management/ Foreign Investment	IA-ASJL-G0190095 $60,000
	Northern Illinois U./ Prince of Songkla U.	THAILAND	Interdisciplinary Studies	IA-ASJL-G0190325 $74,986

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FY	INSTITUTIONS	COUNTRY OR REGION	DISCIPLINE	CONTRACT NO. GRANT AWARD
91	Grambling State U./ U. of Malaya	MALAYSIA	American/Asian Studies	IA-ASPS-G1190263 $70,000
	California State U.-Sac./ Khon Kaen U.	THAILAND	Environmental Studies	IA-ASCS-G1190232 $65,720
	Towson State U./ People's U. of China	PRC	American/Chinese Studies	IA-ASPS-G1190259 $69,840
	U. of Kansas/ Nankai U.	PRC	American/Chinese Studies	IA-ASCS-G1190236 $67,900

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EUROPE

FY	INSTITUTIONS	COUNTRY OR REGION	DISCIPLINE	CONTRACT NO. GRANT AWARD
83	U. of Maine-Orono/ U. of New Brunswick	CANADA	Social Sciences	IA-20810-19-G $47,148
	Emporia State U./ U. of Regina	CANADA	History/ Geography	IA-20811-19-G $42,570
	Longwood College/ U. Jyvaskyla	FINLAND	Physical Educ.	IA-20819-19-G $50,000
	U. of Minnesota/ U. of Iceland	ICELAND	Social Sciences	IA-20806-19-G $49,999
	U. of Washington/ U. of Bergen	NORWAY	Social Sciences	IA-20809-19-G $47,200
	Stanford U./ Stockholm U.	SWEDEN	Education	IA-20822-19-G $49,500
	Case Western U./ Stockholm U.	SWEDEN	Education	IA-20805-19-G $37,000
84	Princeton U./ Crete U.	GREECE	Humanities	IA-21388-19-G $50,000
	Georgetown U./ Ankara U.	TURKEY	Social Sciences	IA-23180-19-G $48,325
	Columbia U./ Istanbul U.	TURKEY	Law	IA-21395-19-G $44,400
	Ohio State U./ Serbian Acad. of Sci.	YUGOSLAVIA	History	IA-21442-19-G $49,210
	SUNY-Albany/ U. of Belgrade	YUGOSLAVIA	Social Sciences	IA-21396-19-G $49,980
	UCLA/ U. Zagreb	YUGOSLAVIA	Social Sciences	IA-21408-19-G $39,420
85	U. of Tulsa/ Natl. Inst. of Higher Education	IRELAND	Business	IA-22054-19-G $48,450
	U. of Southern Maine/ U. Coll. Galway	IRELAND	Social Sciences	IA-22052-19-G $48,450

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FY	INSTITUTIONS	COUNTRY OR REGION	DISCIPLINE	CONTRACT NO. GRANT AWARD
85	Ohio State U./ U. of Istanbul	TURKEY	Business	IA-22051-19-G $46,500
	U. of South Carolina U. of Southampton	UNITED KINGDOM	History	IA-22050-19-G $49,825
86	U. of Minnesota/ Karl Frazens U.-Graz	AUSTRIA	History	IA-AEGH-G6192679 $49,912
	U. of North Carolina U. of Vienna	AUSTRIA	Social Sciences	IA-AEGH-G6192674 $48,852
	U. of Mass-Amherst/ U. Catholique-Louvain	BELGIUM	Psychology	IA-AEGH-G6192689 $49,480
	U. of Pennsylvania/ Katholieke U. Leuven	BELGIUM	Social Sciences	IA-AEGH-G6192691 $50,000
	Central Michigan U./ Gronigen U.	NETHERLANDS	History	IA-AEGH-G6199657 $49,200
	U. of Minnesota/ U. of Amsterdam	NETHERLANDS	American Studies	IA-AEGH-G6192664 $49,973
87	Southern Illinois U./ U. of Sofia	BULGARIA	Sociology/Law Education	IA-ASJL-G7192989 $47,772
	U. of Nebraska-Omaha/ Charles U.	CZECHO-SLOVAKIA	Interdisciplinary Studies	IA-20819-19-G $49,950
	U. of Pittsburgh/ U. of Augsburg	GERMANY	Law	IA-ASJL-G7193001 $47,976
	Va. Polytechnic U./ Budapest Tech. U.	HUNGARY	Urban Planning	IA-ASJL-G7192996 $49,850
	Oregon State System/ Jozsef Attila U.	HUNGARY	American Studies	IA-ASJL-G7192993 $48,104
	U. N. Carolina-Char./ Kingston Polytechnic	UNITED KINGDOM	Constitutional Law	IA-ASJL-G7192994 $48,530
	U. of Pittsburgh/ U. of Ljubljana	YUGOSLAVIA	Sociology/ Political Science	IA-ASJL-G7192992 $48,720
	Texas A&M U./ U. of Zagreb	YUGOSLAVIA	American Literature	IA-ASJL-G7192997 $48,150

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FY	INSTITUTIONS	COUNTRY OR REGION	DISCIPLINE	CONTRACT NO. GRANT AWARD
88	U. of Pennsylvania/ Czech. Acad. of Sci.	CZECHO-SLOVAKIA	Humanities/ Social Sciences	IA-ASJL-G8193320 $49,648
	Comm. Coll. for Intl. Dev./Czech. Tech U.	CZECHO-SLOVAKIA	Interdisciplinary Studies	IA-ASJL-G8193362 $49,648
	U. of Maryland/ Tampere U.	FINLAND	U.S./Soviet Studies	IA-ASJL-G8193318 $49,850
	SUNY-Albany/ U. of Salerno	ITALY	Humanities/ South. Italian Studies	IA-ASJL-G8193369 $45,890
	Ohio State U./ U. of Genoa	ITALY	Humanities/ Columbus Quincentennial	IA-ASJL-G8193310 $50,000
	Boston U./ Sup. Schools of Educ.	PORTUGAL	Education	IA-ASJL-G8193370 $49,990
89	Southern Ill. U.-Carb. Latvian Acad. of Music	SOVIET UNION (LATVIA)	Music	G9193679 $48,724
	U. of Minnesota/ Marie Curie U.	POLAND	Interdisciplinary Studies	G9193682 $50,000
	Stanford U./ Jagiellonian U.	POLAND	Social Sciences	G9193683 $50,000
	U. of Arizona/ Insts. in Turkmen Rep.	SOVIET UNION	Arid Lands Studies	G9193677 $42,300
	U. of Minn.-Duluth/ Petrozavodsk St. U.	SOVIET UNION	Social Sciences	G9193676 $49,350
	Duke University/ Aut. U. of Barcelona	SPAIN*	U.S./Spanish Studies	G9193681 $50,000
	Southern Ill. U-Carb. Cukurova University	TURKEY	English/Linguistics	G9193675 $49,300
90	Bentley College/ Estonian Mgmt. Inst.	SOVIET UNION (ESTONIA)	Business Management	IA-ASJL-G0190254 $75,000
	City College-CUNY/ Humboldt U.	GERMANY	Education	IA-ASJL-G0190251 $75,000
	Colorado State U./ Tech. U. of Budapest	HUNGARY	Environmental Studies	IA-ASJL-G0190264 $74,940

*See FY 89 American Republics grants for 1992 Quincentennial grants involving Spain

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FY	INSTITUTIONS	COUNTRY OR REGION	DISCIPLINE	CONTRACT NO. GRANT AWARD
90	Kent State U./ Vilnius U.	SOVIET UNION (LITHUANIA)	Multidisciplinary Studies	IA-ASJL-G0190249 $62,790
	Fordham U./ Kiev Intl. Mgmt. Inst.	SOVIET UNION	Business Admin.	IA-ASJL-G0190355 $70,000
	Eastern Wash. U./ U. of Veljko Vlahovic	YUGOSLAVIA	Business Admin.	IA-ASJL-G0190265 $74,706
91	U. of Illinois-UC/ Cath. U. of Leuven/ Wageningen Agric. U.	BELGIUM NETHERLANDS	Environmental Studies	IA-ASPS-G1190234 $99,744
	U. of Pittsburgh/ U. of Augsburg/ U. of Brussels	GERMANY BELGIUM	Law/ Dispute Resolution	IA-ASCS-G1190239 $99,963
	DePaul U./ Prague School of Econ.	CZECH & SLOVAK F.R.	Business Admin.	IA-ASCS-G1190235 $68,600
	Hofstra U./ Palacky U.	CZECH & SLOVAK F.R.	Law	IA-ASCS-G1190230 $26,953
	U. of Tennessee-Knox./ Masaryk U.	CZECH & SLOVAK F.R.	Environmental Studies	IA-ASPS-G1190264 $68,973
	City College-CUNY/ Inst. of Chem. Tech.	CZECH & SLOVAK F.R.	Environmental Studies	IA-ASCS-G1190240 $70,000
	U. of N. Hampshire/ Budapest U. of Econ. Sci./ Hungarian Coll. for Catering and Hotel Mgmt.	HUNGARY	Business Admin./ Tourism	IA-ASPS-G1190265 $56,700
	U. of Nebraska-Linc./ Eotvos Lorand U. of Sci./ Hungarian Acad. of Sci.	HUNGARY	Environmental Studies	IA-ASCS-G1190233 $54,100
	Case W. Reserve U./ Eotvos Lorand U. of Sci.	HUNGARY	Public Administration	IA-ASCS-G1190229 $39,983
	Central Conn. St. U./ Wroclaw Tech. U.	POLAND	Business Administration	IA-ASCS-G1190231 $69,842
	U. of Minnesota-TC/ Novosibirsk St. U.	SOVIET UNION	Environmental Studies	IA-ASPS-G1190250 $65,900

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FY	INSTITUTIONS	COUNTRY OR REGION	DISCIPLINE	CONTRACT NO. GRANT AWARD
91	Portland State U./ Khabarovsk Inst. of Natl. Econ.	SOVIET UNION	Business Admin.	IA-ASPS-G1190255 $69,950
	U. of Pittsburgh/ Inst. of Econ. and Indust. Engineering	SOVIET UNION	Economics	IA-ASPS-G1190257 $64,850
	U. of Michigan/ Lvov State U.	SOVIET UNION	Business Admin./ Political Science/ Economics	IA-ASCS-G1190237 $50,650

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NORTH AFRICA, NEAR EAST, AND SOUTH ASIA

FY	INSTITUTIONS	COUNTRY OR REGION	DISCIPLINE	CONTRACT NO. GRANT AWARD
82	Indiana U. of Penn./ Ain Shams U.	EGYPT	Area Studies/ Education	IA-20342-19-G $50,000
	Georgia Inst. of Tech./ School of Planning	INDIA	Urban Planning/ Architecture	IA-20820-19-G $37,958
	U. of Tennessee/ Yarmouk U.	JORDAN	Middle East Studies/ Urban Studies	IA-21418-19-G $48,710
	U. of Illinois-UC/ U. of Khartoum	SUDAN	Commerce/ Business	IA-20331-19-G $50,000
	U. of Southern Cal./ U. of Tunis	TUNISIA	Development/ Economics	IA-21328-19-G $50,000
83	U. of Pennsylvania/ Mohammed V U.	MOROCCO	Humanities/ General Studies	IA-20794-19-G $50,000
	Southern Illinois U. Tribhuvan U.	NEPAL	Education	IA-20832-19-G $49,946
84	City U. of New York/ Tel Aviv U.	ISRAEL	Hebrew Studies	IA-21418-19-G $50,000
	U. of Connecticut/ U. of Peradeniya	SRI LANKA	Anthropology	IA-21394-19-G $50,000
	Iowa State U./ Ahfad U.	SUDAN	Home Economics	IA-21419-19-G $50,000
	U. of Missouri/ Press Inst of Tunis	TUNISIA	Journalism	IA-21420-19-G $50,000
85	Grambling State U./ Gandhigram Rural U.	INDIA	Social Sciences	IA-22004-19-G $50,000
	Indiana U./ U. of Poona	INDIA	Asian Studies	IA-22014-19-G $50,000
	Old Dominion U./ Mohammed V U.	MOROCCO	Area Studies	IA-22018-19-G $50,000
	American U./ Colombo U.	SRI LANKA	Intl. Relations	IA-21998-19-G $50,000

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FY	INSTITUTIONS	COUNTRY OR REGION	DISCIPLINE	CONTRACT NO. GRANT AWARD
85	U. of New Hampshire/ U. Sri Jayewardenapura.	SRI LANKA	Management Studies	IA-22016-19-G $49,950
86	U. of Illinois-UC/ M. S. U. Baroda	INDIA	Women's Studies	IA-AEGH-G6192653 $59,194
	New York U./ SNDT Women's U.-Bombay	INDIA	Education	IA-AEGH-G6192665 $56,100
	U. of Wisconsin-Mil./ An Najah Natl. U.	WEST BANK	Humanities	IA-AEGH-G6192658 $60,000
87	U. of Illinois-Chicago/ Zagazig U.	EGYPT	Criminal Justice	IA-ASJL-G7193002 $33,958
	Duke U./ Cadi Ayyad U.	MOROCCO	North African/ American Studies	IA-ASJL-G7192988 $49,780
	U. of Pennsylvania/ U. of Peshawar	PAKISTAN	Central Asian Studies	IA-ASJL-G7193000 $59,970
88	Temple University/ U. of Algiers	ALGERIA	American Studies/ French	IA-ASJL-G8193332 $59,737
	Southern Illinois U. Dhaka University	BANGLADESH	Journalism/ Communications	IA-ASJL-G8193333 $49,992
	U. of Chicago/ U. of Damascus	SYRIA	Archaeology/ American Studies	IA-ASJL-G8193308 $60,000
89	U. of Wisconsin-Mad./ Hebrew University	ISRAEL	Intl. Relations	G9193672 $50,000
	Texas Tech. U./ Jordan U. of Sci. and Tech.	JORDAN	Arid Lands Studies	G9193667 $49,900
	Texas Consortium/ Jordan University	JORDAN	Interdisciplinary Studies	G9193762 $49,900
	U. of Pennsylvania/ Quad-i-Azam University	PAKISTAN	U.S./Pakistani Studies	G9193678 $50,000
90	Southern Ill. U./ Helwan U.	EGYPT	Communications	IA-ASJL-G0190273 $64,315
	West Virginia U./ Indian Inst. of Tech./ Tech. Teachers Training Inst.	INDIA	Technology Education	IA-ASJL-G0190266 $59,586

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FY	INSTITUTIONS	COUNTRY OR REGION	DISCIPLINE	CONTRACT NO. GRANT AWARD
90	Oregon State U./ Avinashilingam Inst.	INDIA	Social Sciences	IA-ASJL-G0190269 $73,600
	Pennsylvania State U./ U. of Khartoum	SUDAN	Education	IA-ASJL-G0190253 $54,965
91	Texas Tech. U./ U. of Jordan	JORDAN	Language/ Arid Lands Studies	IA-ASPS-G1190261 $69,909
	Bowdoin College/ U. of Peradeniya	SRI LANKA	Asian Studies	IA-ASPS-G1190262 $69,610

E/ASU:1517H:10/16/91

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UNIVERSITY AFFILIATIONS GRANT STATISTICS

AFRICA

COUNTRY	NUMBER OF GRANTS
Benin	1
Botswana	1
Burkina Faso	1
Burundi	2
Cameroon	3
Congo	1
Ethiopia	2
Ghana	2
Ivory Coast	1
Kenya	5
Lesotho	2
Malawi	1
Mauritius	1
Niger	2
Nigeria	8
Senegal	2
Sierra Leone	11
Somalia	1
South Africa	4
Swaziland	1
Tanzania	2
Togo	1
Uganda	1
Zimbabwe	3
Total	59

****

AMERICAN REPUBLICS

COUNTRY	NUMBER OF GRANTS
Argentina	3
Bahamas	1
Belize	3
Bolivia	1
Brazil	14
Chile	3
Colombia	4
Costa Rica	5
Dominican Republic	4
Guatemala	1
Honduras	1
Jamaica	3
Mexico	9
Panama	1
Peru	1
Uruguay	1
Venezuela	3
Total	58

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EAST ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

COUNTRY	NUMBER OF GRANTS
Australia	3
Burma	1
Indonesia	2
Japan	3
Malaysia	1
Micronesia	1
New Zealand	2
Philippines	6
Papua New Guinea	1
Peoples Rep. of China	14
Singapore	1
South Korea	6
Thailand	8
Western Samoa	1
Total	50

****

EUROPE

COUNTRY	NUMBER OF GRANTS
Austria	2
Belgium	4
Bulgaria	1
Canada	2
Czech & Slovak Fed. Rep.	7
Estonia	1
Finland	2
Germany	3
Greece	1
Hungary	6
Iceland	1
Ireland	2
Italy	2
Latvia	1
Lithuania	1
Netherlands	3
Norway	1
Poland	3
Portugal	1
Soviet Union	7
Spain*	1
Sweden	2
Turkey	4
United Kingdom	2
Yugoslavia	5
Total	65

*Does not include 1992 Quincentennial grants listed under AR.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NORTH AFRICA, NEAR EAST, AND SOUTH ASIA

COUNTRY	NUMBER OF GRANTS
Algeria	1
Bangladesh	1
Egypt	3
India	7
Israel	2
Jordan	4
Morocco	3
Nepal	1
Pakistan	2
Sri Lanka	4
Sudan	3
Syria	1
Tunisia	2
West Bank	1
Total	35

E/ASU:1745H:10/16/91

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX 2-A

AMIDEAST

EDUCATION AND TRAINING FOR MIDDLE EAST DEVELOPMENT

August 24, 1992

Mr. Stuart Richardson
Research Associate
Council on International Educational Exchange
205 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10017

Dear Mr. Richardson:

Leslie Nucho of Amideast's Washington office sent us a copy of your August 3 letter concerning the feasibility study CIEE is preparing for U.S.A.I.D. on a program to give some financial assistance to U.S. professors who would teach in institutions in less developed countries. In it you asked for Amideast's views on the value of such a program and, if possible, statements from institutions in the region attesting to their need for it.

Despite the fact that U.S. citizens are, at present, unable to travel to Lebanon, we so strongly believe in the importance of such a program for Lebanese universities that we wish to address the question in the hope that U.S.A.I.D. would include Lebanon in its planning for the time when Americans are again allowed to travel to the country. Further, taking into account the ban on U.S. citizens, we made a proposal (in May 1991) to U.S.I.A. for scholars in American institutions with Lebanese or Lebanese/American citizenships to come to the Lebanese University on short-term assignments. This program could be implemented almost immediately. A copy of the proposal is attached.

Since time is short, and most universities are on holiday, we are taking the liberty to represent postsecondary institutions in Lebanon by responding to the CIEE call for information regarding its feasibility study.

Amideast has been an information center for educational institutions in Lebanon for over 20 years, particularly during the war years which deprived the educational system in Lebanon of almost all its resources.

We have received direct, formal requests from the following Lebanese universities:

Lebanese University (French-system, gradually converting to the American system in many Faculties)
Notre Dame University (American system)
Balamand University (American system)
Haigazian University College (American system)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

America-Mideast Educational & Training Services, Inc.
Ras Beirut Center - P. O. Box 135-155 - Beirut - Lebanon - Phone 345341 - Telex: Joeint 21665 LE - 20680 LE
Antelias - P.O. Box 70-744 - Antelias - Lebanon - Phone 411676 / 410438 - Telex: Public 49006 LE Att. Amideast

The requests fall under the broad areas of:

a. Faculty development program assistance
b. Exchange of professors, namely from the U.S. to Lebanon
c. U.S. university linkage programs
d. English language program enrichment

Two of these universities, Notre Dame and Balamand, are American-style universities that opened during the Lebanese war years in response, even at that time, to the public's demand for an American-style education. Further, the Lebanese University and Haigazian College, also during the same years, initiated programs or program development plans along these lines.

We would also like to recommend that American institutions in Lebanon (such as the American University of Beirut and the Beirut University College) be granted special status under such a study since the war has deprived them of many of their former privileges such as support for and direct recruitment of American faculty.

The present economic situation is exacerbating the problems Lebanese postsecondary institutions face in their attempts to upgrade their programs and faculty. Over the past few years inflation has been rampant and the currency has devalued to such an extent that it is almost in free-fall; the economy is de facto dollar-driven. Whereas educational institutions realize the bulk of their income from student fees paid in Lebanese Lira, their expenses are linked to the dollar. This discrepancy becomes daily more untenable. Physical plants cannot be repaired, added to, or improved; programs cannot be innovated or improved; faculty salaries sink ever lower.

Qualified American faculty are needed in almost all fields at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. Most doctoral programs and many master's programs in institutions in Lebanon have had to close or try to function with fewer and less qualified faculty.

In conclusion, Mr. Richardson, we strongly affirm that a U.S.A.I.D. program such as this would be of immense benefit to Lebanese postsecondary institutions. As a result of the 16 years of war, these institutions suffered extensive destruction and damage to their physical facilities; foreign faculty along with many of the best qualified Lebanese faculty left the country; the faculty - and administrators - who remained are beset with a prevailing sense of anomie and isolation; every institution is in dire financial straits. The program U.S.A.I.D. is considering would address, at least in part, many of these problems.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

We are sharing your request, and our preliminary response to it, with the heads of Lebanese universities, many of whom, we are certain, will wish to write you directly.

Sincerely yours,

Phyllis Salem
Country Director

encs.

cc Leslie Nucho, Amideast Washington
Presidents and Rectors of:
American University of Beirut
Balamand University
Beirut University College
Haigazian University College
Lebanese University
Notre Dame University
Mr. Vincent Battle, DCM,
Acting Director A.I.D.
U.S. Embassy, Beirut

Best Copy AVAILABLE

EXCHANGE OF SCHOLARS

A PROGRAMMING IDEA PRESENTED TO THE
UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY, FULBRIGHT PROGRAM
by

AMIDEAST LEBANON
May 19, 1991

Although the "spirit and mandate" of the Fulbright program cannot be fully served at present by bringing American scholars to Lebanon, this central element of the program could be partially met through the exchange of Lebanese-American scholars and/or Lebanese nationals now in academic institutions in the United States. Many of these individuals were formerly affiliated with institutions in Lebanon, and their return, even if short-term and temporary, could be beneficial to both the individual and the institution.

The Lebanese University is particularly interested in this kind of program. From the early 1970's until the late 1980's the University, under its Faculty Development Scholarship Program, sent its most talented graduating students abroad to get doctoral degrees and then return to serve on the University's faculty. (Amideast administered the programs of those who did their doctoral work in the United States.) Because of the deleterious effect of the war on the country and on the physical facilities and morale of staff and administration of the Lebanese University - not to mention the low remuneration it can offer - many of these scholars did not come back.

Some of them are now with academic institutions in the United States from which they could request a leave of absence for short periods to teach at the Lebanese University. (This could be done at any time during the year and fitted into the University's program.) These exchange scholars would not only fill badly-needed professorial positions, but would also act as catalysts to the faculty already in place, bringing with them new ideas, new systems, new knowledge, and new approaches to education. This plan could have the desirable spin-off effect of convincing the reluctant ex-patriot that conditions in Lebanon are now such that it is possible - both safe and productive - for him or her to return.

Such short-term stints will not solve the Lebanese University's need (or that of any other university in Lebanon) to build up a strong, highly-qualified faculty, for such requires a long-term investment. It would, however, be a highly-innovative and highly-effective short-term, stop-gap measure to meet an immediate and urgent need.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX 2-B

CONSEJO UNIVERSITARIO INTERAMERICANO PARA EL DESARROLLO ECONOMICO Y SOCIAL
INTERAMERICAN UNIVERSITY COUNCIL FOR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT
OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

FAX

14.8.92

Mr. Henry D. Weaver
Senior Consultant
Council on International Educational Exchange
Fax: 95 (212) 972 3231

Dear Mr. Weaver:

I have just received your letter dated July 27. As for as I understand you are consulting for the USAID, a feasibility study to provide financial assistance to US professors who would spend some time teaching in less developed countries, cj. LAC.

I found that proyect extremely important for the new relationship between US and LA&C, and as you know we have 12 years experience in international cooperation and have contacted about one hundred and fifty universities in 12 LA&C countries. I also have recently researched in that field on priority areas and the mecanism to make the relationship sustainable and with major impact than in the past specially in the model of the fifties and sixties.

Please let me know what can I do for that feasibility study.

Dr. Oscar Soria
Executive Director

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Apdo. postal 1-440 - C.P. 44100 - Guadalajara - Jalisco - México
Tel: 52 (36) 417061 Ext. 32202 - Fax: 52 (36) 425427

APPENDIX 2-C

THE ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

Ratasastra Building
Chulalongkorn University
Henri Dunant Road
Bangkok 10330, Thailand.

CABLE ADDRESS
"ASAIHL"
BANGKOK
Telephone : 251-6966
FAX: (662)255-4441

Our Ref. No. 0840 /1992
Your Ref.

August 19, 1992

Dr. John Skillman
Deputy Executive Director &
Director, Asia-Pacific Region
Council on International Educational Exchange
205 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10017
U.S.A.

Dear Dr. Skillman,

Thank you for your letter of July 28 informing us of the feasibility study for volunteer or retired professors to work in less developed countries. I am sure that the ASAIHL member institutions in Southeast Asia would welcome such a project. The fields of study in engineering, computer and business administration are most likely to be requested.

I am sorry that I will not be able to attend your Berlin conference as there are provious commitments and we will have the UMAP working party meeting in Brunei in November. I hope that you will be able to attend our General Conference at the University of the Philippines at Los Banos, Laguna where you can meet our university rectors, vice-chancellors and presidents in the region. There will be no registration fees for all overseeas participants who will have to pay for own breakfast and accommodation.

By the way, I made copies of your letter and sent to all our member institution in Southeast Asia and you may get some responses from them.

We look forward to welcoming you in the Philippines.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Ninnat Olanvoravuth
Secretary-General

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX 2-D

INTERNATIONAL NETWORK FOR UNIVERSITY VOLUNTEERS

Council on International Educational Exchange

PROGRAM INTRODUCTION

THE PROGRAM

The International Network for University Volunteers, (INUV), will be an information network to assist currently employed and retired university and college professionals to find temporary positions in needy institutions of higher learning. The program will be coordinated by the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE) through its offices in New York, Paris and Tokyo.

OPPORTUNITIES LISTING DATABASE

The heart of the program will be two constantly updated databases. One database will contain specific information on the needs of institutions. The other database will list names and information about people who wish to volunteer their services. Accessing the database in order to conduct a listings search could be done by anyone linked to the network. It therefore will be readily available to individuals on the networks, to international education offices, to university libraries, to university emeriti offices, to university officials seeking volunteers and other university offices. It may also be copied electronically or printed free of charge.

Each listing in the institutional opportunities database will give the details of an opening including the time period needed, the field of expertise, the host institution where the service will be performed, language skills required, what will be provided by the host institution (such as housing), what grants if any are available and information on who to contact for further information. The user will be able to electronically sort the information by various keys, such as discipline, time frame, language, host country etc.

Each individual listing will give the name, experience, and highest degree of the person, discipline, time available, language ability and telephone, BITNET, FAX or other contact information.

The institution or individual placing the listing will pay a fee for the service which will cover the cost of operation of the databases.

ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS

Any tertiary institution of education that is accredited by the responsible accrediting agency for the country in which it is located is eligible to place a listing as a host institution. The accrediting body will normally be the country's Ministry of Education or similar government body or a regional accrediting agency. It is expected that the majority of institutions participating will be located in less developed countries.

Any current or former employee of an accredited institution of higher education will be eligible to place a listing as a potential volunteer. It is expected that the majority of volunteers will be located in more developed countries.

SERVICE OFFERED BY THE NETWORK

One might break down the various elements that must be in place for a university volunteer to go to a host institution of higher learning in a another country as follows:

1. INFORMATION OF OPPORTUNITY:

The volunteer must become aware of the need in the host institution abroad or the institution must become aware of the availability of the individual.

2. ACCEPTANCE PROCEDURE:

The volunteer and the host institution must become sufficiently informed about each other that each party decides to move ahead with the placement.

3. LOGISTICS:

Someone must handle the logistics of getting the volunteer (and family if involved) on site abroad. This includes (but is not limited to) providing information about the tasks to be performed, providing information about the living conditions and culture abroad, arranging for housing abroad, arranging for visas, transportation, insurance, inoculations and reception upon arrival.

4. FINANCES:

Sufficient financial resources need to be available to provide salary, transportation and incidental costs. Any or all of these might come from the volunteers personal resources, the host institution or a granting agency.

5. DIRECTION:

Someone in the host institution must be designated to direct the work of the volunteer and to assist with logistics upon arrival.

For the International Network of University Volunteers, the service to be given is only the service of information about opportunities and personnel available. However each listing of an opportunity will indicate the acceptance procedure, who will handle the logistics and what financial resources are available. In accessing the database information will be given to allow the potential volunteer or the institution to make their own matches.

In many cases the process of selection and the logistics will be handled by a partner institution

in a more developed country. Thousands of such linkages between universities now exist and frequently have some grant aid that will be available for assisting the placement of the volunteer.

LANGUAGES

The databases will be listed in English, French and Spanish. However during the pilot phase, it is expected that the database will be available only in English and Spanish.

GETTING ON THE DATABASES

Listing on the databases can be gained in two ways. First will be by contacting CIEE directly through its offices in New York, Paris or To[illegible]o. Second will be through other organizations acting as database agents. National or international consortia of universities, Emeriti centers at universities or other agencies assisting potential volunteers may contract with CIEE to take listings. They will collect the same fee as CIEE, but will receive a discount the size of which will depend on whether they transmit the information to CIEE electronically or in written form.

APPENDIX 2-E

August 30, 1992

Sohair Saad
Associate Director
Educational Resource Center
AMIDEAST

Greetings...

This is in reference to your letter dated Aug. 25, 1992 regarding preparing a feasibility study for the US Agency for International Development for a plan to have U.S. professors spend time teaching in institutions in developing countries.

I am honored to inform you that Egyptian institutions would welcome this idea provided that we are informed of the specializations of the U.S. professors. Thanks and regards.

Chairman of the Central Department

Mohamed Sami Morsi

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX 2-F

جامعة اليرموك

YARMOUK UNIVERSITY

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Ref. PR/133/15/1472

Date 1/Sep./1992

Mrs . Janine R. El-Tal
AMIDEAST , Jordan
P.O.Box 1249, Jebel El-Weibdeh
Amman

Dear Mrs. El-Tal

Thank you for your letter of August 1992 and enclosed letter from the Council on International Educational Exchange inquiring on the receptivity of foreign universities to host American professors during their sabbatical year for teaching or research purposes . It is my pleasure to advise that Yarmouk University welcomes hosting such professors and benefitting from their services as stated in your aforesaid letter , provided that this will be done through previous correspondence and that choice be made by Yarmouk University in accordance with its needs .

With kind regards .

Sincerely ,

Fuad Sheikh Salam

Dr. Fuad Sheikh Salam
Acting President.

Irbid - Jordan Tel. (02) 271100 Telex 51533 YARMUK JO Fax (02) 274725 Cable: Yarmouk

APPENDIX 2-G

THE CHINESE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG 香港中文大學

SHATIN · NT · HONG KONG · TEL.: 609 6000 609 7000
TELEGRAM 香港中文大學 : SINOVERSITY
TELEX 香港中文大學 : 50301 CUHK HX
FAX 香港中文大學 (852) 603 5544

學術聯繫辦事處
OFFICE OF ACADEMIC LINKS

TELEPHONE : (852) 609-7591
FACSIMILE : (852) 603-5402

September 4, 1992

Dr. Ninnat Olanvoravuth
Secretary-General
The Association of Southeast Asian
Institutions of Higher Learning
Chulalongkorn University
Ratasatra Building 2
Henri Dunant Road
Bangkok 10330
Thailand

Dear Dr. Olanvoravuth:

Thank you very much for your letter of August 21st to Vice-Chancellor Kao regarding the CIEE feasibility study for USAID. The Vice-Chancellor has asked me to reply.

As indicated in Dr. Skillman's letter, this type of USAID-funded program to assist volunteer or retired academics from the U.S. to serve in the less developed areas of the region would probably not be of strong interest to Hong Kong institutions. As you are aware, Hong Kong institutions are experiencing growth and the need for top-quality new academics. However, most of these positions are being filled on a longer-term basis through international recruitment efforts of a coordinated and individual institution type.

There may be instances related to a specific research project or teaching need where such volunteer professors could be of help to Hong Kong institutions. This would have to be determined and negotiated on a case-by-case basis.

Professor Kao and I will be attending the ASAIHL General Conference at the University of the Philippines at Los Banos and would be happy to discuss this initiative with you and Dr. Skillman. John is a very old friend from my days working in New York City from 1973-83. I do hope he is able to attend the Los Banos conference.

I look forward to meeting you in the Philippines in December.

With best regards.

Yours sincerely,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mark L. Sheldon
Director

MLS/el
cc: Professor Charles Kao
Dr. John Skillman

APPENDIX 2-H

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANILA

Founded 1913
546 Dr. Mariano V. de los Santos, Sr. St.
Sampaloc, Manila 2806
Philippines

Telephones:
741-3637
741-3650
Cable Address:
UNIVMAN

September 8, 1992

Dr. John Skillman
Deputy Executive Director
and Director, Asia-Pacific Region
Council on International
Educational Exchange
205 East 42nd Ave., New York
NY 10017, U.S.A.

Dear Dr. Skillman:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated July 28, 1992 which was forwarded to this University by Dr. Ninnat Olanvoravuth, Secretary General of ASAIHL.

Please be informed that The University of Manila is interested in participating in the proposal to send U.S. professors to ASAIHL member institutions on a voluntary basis.

The fields of study which interest us include English language and literature, Economics, Public Administration, Civil Engineering, Industrial Engineering.

We consider the proposal as useful and valuable to ASAIHL institutions as it will enrich their faculty and acquaint them with new methods of instruction.

We hope to hear from you again regarding this project.

With best wishes, I am

Very truly yours,

VIRGILIO DE LOS SANTOS
President

cc:
Dr. Ninnat Olanvoravuth, ASAIHL

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Member: INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITIES
ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING
PHILIPPINE ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

APPENDIX 2-I

สถาบันเทคโนโลยีการเกษตรแม่โจ้
MAEJO INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGY (MIAT)

สำนักงานอธิการบดี
อ.สันทราย จ.เชียงใหม่ 50290
โทรศัพท์ (6653) 498858-62
โทรสาร (6653) 498861-62

Office of the President
Sansai, Chiang Mai 50290 Thailand
PHONE : (6653) 498858-62
FAX : (6653) 498861-62

September 8, 1992

John Skillman, Ph.D.
Deputy Executive Director &
Director, Asia-Pacific Region
Council on International Educational Exchange
205 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10017
U.S.A.

Dear Dr. Skillman:

We have received news from Dr. Ninnat Olanvorayuth, Secretary-General of ASAIHL, regarding CIEE feasibility study on USAID volunteer professors to teach in Southeast Asia. As a small teaching institute in northern Thailand which emphasizes agriculture and is undergoing rapid expansion, Maejo University would welcome any assistance from experts in various fields applicable to agriculture. Particular fields which deserve prompt improvements are biotechnology, computer science, agro-industry and environmental science.

Hence, if the above-mentioned USAID plan comes into being, we would be much obliged if you would include Maejo University as a possible recipient for the assistance. Thank you kindly for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Ahnon Tiangtrong.

Ahnon Tiangtrong, Ph.D.
President

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

VICE CHANCELLOR
NIVERSITI BRUNEI DARUSSALAM

ناىب چيسسس
يونيبرسيتى بروني دارالسلام

APPENDIX 2-J

UBD/CAN - 107/pt.II(56) 8 September 1992

Dr. John Skillman
Deputy Executive Director
Council on International Educational Exchange
205 East 42nd. Street
New York, NY 10017
U.S.A.

Dear Dr. Skillman,

Dr. Ninnat of ASAIHL has extended me a copy of your letter (28/7/92) regarding the proposed Volunteer Professors Scheme.

University Brunei Darussalam will be interested in receiving Visiting Professors who can be with us for at least one semester in the following areas:-

Early Childhood Education
Management Studies (HRM, Marketing, Finance and Accounting, MIS)

We currently have a Fulbright Fellow whom we are providing free housing, a car, a per diem of $B80 per day and free medical/dental facilities at the Government hospital. The same facilities can be provided to Professors in your scheme.

I look forward hearing more from you in due course.

Yours sincerely,

DATO HAJI ABU BAKAR APONG
Vice-Chancellor

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Bandar Seri Begawan 3186 **Negara Brunei Darussalam**

Tel: 428957, 427001 Ext. 100 *Telefax: 427003* *Telex: BU 2725*

ASEAN INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH DEVELOPMENT (AIHD)
25/5 PHUTTHAMONTHON 4, SALAYA, NAKHON CHAISRI, NAKHON PATHOM 73170, THAILAND
TEL : (662) 4419040-3, 4419870-2, FAX : (662) 4419044
CABLE AND TELEX : 84770 UNIMAHI TH

APPENDIX 2-K

No. AIHD 195/ 1992

September 11, 1992

Dr. John Skillman
Council on International Educational Exchange
205 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10017

Dear Dr. Skillman,

I would like to ask for your permission to introduce myself and my institute. The ASEAN Institute for Health Development, Mahidol University is an ASEAN region center for the development of primary health care and quality of life. Annually we conduct an international Master of Primary Health Care Management Program and international training programs in areas ranging from community-based development to primary health care to family planning. As Director of AIHD I found out about the USAID proposal from University president, Dr. Pradit Chareonthaitawee, by way of Dr. Ninnat Olanvoravuth, Chulalongkorn University. They thought that the institute here might somehow be able to support the project.

I feel that your proposed program is an excellent one. In my travels as director, I have had the opportunity, along with my colleagues at the University, to meet distinguished professors from various countries, who could make great contributions on short-term stays here at our institute. As a matter of fact JICA (The Japan International Cooperation Agency) sponsors a number of annual guest lecturers and technical experts here at the institute each year, who are able to provide fresh and thoughtful insight into our programs. I see you program filling a gap. Many times there is a will for these professors to visit, but there is a lack of a financial way. I personally have an extensive list of professors I would like to have work with us here, but lack the appropriate funding to compensate them, and I'm sure that many

other similar institutes are the same. In this regard the proposed project could provide fundamental, purposive, and powerful support to academic and technical programs.

I am very interested in keeping up with the status of this proposal. Please contact me directly if you feel that I can be of any assistance. I feel that aid in health information systems, particularly computer software, would be most meaningful for my situation here.

I look forward to further correspondence with you.

Sincerely,

Y. Porapakkham

Yawarat Porapakkham, M.D., M.P.H., M.S.P.H.
Director, AIHD

ENCL : BOOKLET

APPENDIX 2-L

Canselori
UNIVERSITI PERTANIAN MALAYSIA
43400 UPM Serdang, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia.

Telefon: 9485425, 9486101 Teleks: UNIPER MA 37454 Fax: 03-9483244

Ruj. tuan:
Ruj. Kami: UPM/NC/BL-11
Tarikh: 11 September 1992

Dr. John Skillman
Deputy Executive Director & Director
Asia-Pacific Region
Council on International Educational Exchange
205 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10017
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Dear Dr. Skillman,

I wish to refer to your letter of 28 July 1992 to Dr. Ninnat Olanvoravuth, Secretary General of ASAIHL. I had the pleasure of reading your letter which has been most informative. Dr. Ninnat Olanvoravuth suggested that I write you regarding UPM's interest in receiving the service of some volunteer U.S. Professors.

In connection with USAID Aid Program, I would like to state Universiti Pertanian Malaysia's interest in collaborating with USAID in the following fields of study:

1. Electronic/Computer/Mechanical/ and System Engineering
2. Biotechnology
3. Environmental Sciences
4. English Language
5. Accounting
6. Computer Science
7. Other related fields

At the outset, I should perhaps explain that, although UPM is predominantly an agricultural and scientific institution, we have through the years diversified our interest and enlarged our scope to cover areas in the social sciences and education.

Universiti Pertanian Malaysia is the only institution of higher learning in agriculture in Malaysia. It has a long and distinguished record of academic excellence and innovation which began with its foundation in 1971. The University is committed to the triology of functions namely teaching, research and extension as its basic contribution to the growth

and development of the nation. The University began its academic program at degree level in July 1973 with three foundation faculties i.e. Faculty of Agriculture, Faculty of Forestry and Faculty of Veterinary Medicine and Animal Science. Today the University has over 10,000 students of whom about 700 are following the post-graduate studies at Master and Ph.D. levels and is organised into ten faculties and an academic centre with a total of about 39 academic departments. The ten faculties are: Agriculture; Economics and Management; Educational Studies; Engineering; Fisheries and Marine Science; Food Science and Biotechnology; Forestry; Human Ecology; Science and Environmental Studies; and Veterinary Medicine and Animal Science, while the centre is: The Centre for Extension and Continuing Education.

As Malaysia is entering into the industralisation phase, there is an outcry for the demand of more trained and experienced personnel to meet the requirements of development program. Therefore, if it is feasible UPM would much appreciate if the services of professors in the above-mentioned disciplines could be suggested for the initial identification of trained personnel for a minimum period of about one to two years. This is just our preliminary proposal but I believe there should be no difficulty in identifying suitable candidates for participation.

Let me reiterate UPM's interest and need for volunteer U.S. Professors to be attached at UPM during their sabbatical leave or after their retirement. Having clarified UPM's stand on this program it is obvious that we in UPM will be most happy to make arrangements to provide housing either on or outside campus for the professors. Other formal details could be worked in due course when your proposal has been accepted. However, in the meantime, it would be useful for you to visit the UPM. Should you have the opportunity to visit Malaysia in the near future, please drop by on our campus.

With best wishes.

Yours sincerely,

(PROFESSOR TAN SRI DATO' DR. NAYAN ARIFFIN)
Vice-Chancellor UPM